

# CODEX B AND ITS ALLIES

A Study and an Indictment

## PART I

BY

H. C. HOSKIER

AUTHOR OF

"CONCERNING THE GENESIS OF THE VERSIONS OF THE N.T." ;

"CONCERNING THE DATE OF THE BOHAIRIC VERSION" ;

AND EDITOR OF COLLATIONS OF "THE MORGAN GOSPELS," AND OF  
THE GREEK CURSIVES 157 AND 604 (700).

ὁ βίος βραχύς, ἡ δὲ τέχνη μακρή,  
ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὀξύς, ἡ δὲ πείρα σφαλερὴ, ἡ δὲ κρίσις χαλεπή.  
Δεῖ δὲ οὐ μόνον ἑαυτὸν παρέχειν τὰ δέοντα ποιέοντα, ἀλλὰ  
καὶ τὸν νοσέοντα, καὶ τοὺς παρεόντας, καὶ τὰ ἔξωθεν.

—Hippocrates (*Aphor.* I.)

# CODEX B AND ITS ALLIES

A Study and an Indictment

PART A

BY

H. C. HOSKIER

PART I

**Codex B and Its Allies**

By Hoskier, H.C.

Bernard Quaritch · 1914.

THIS ESSAY IS RESPECTFULLY  
DEDICATED TO  
THE NEXT BODY OF  
REVISERS  
IN THE HOPE THAT  
IT MAY PROVE OF SOME SERVICE  
TO THEM.





Note - This book was originally posted FREE at [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org)  
*Many other Free Ebooks available there.*

### *Books for your consideration*

It would be a mistake to suggest that we agree with all of the books we will list below. No book or author is perfect, and neither is this list.

However, there is material in these sources, that do relate to the topic of the book in which this list is found, and these Ebooks are therefore listed for your potential consideration.

Agree or disagree with them, Freedom of Choice and thinking belong to each individual. Make up your own mind.

Codex B and Allies by Hoskier (review of Vaticanus, Sinait. and NKJV)  
Relevant to all versions and manuscripts, including Tischendorf, Wescott & Hort, J White, Burgon, Riplinger, Cumbey, etc

Battle for the Bible by Professor Harold Lindsell

All books by John William Burgon, Oxford, including  
Revision Revised

New Age Bible Versions by Riplinger (often attacked though not much substantiated against, her own videos are available online and for Free) [Hidden Dangers of Rainbow by C.C. Is an old Standby as is New Age Messiah by same]. A Time of Departing by Youngen, and Deceived on Purpose by Warren Smith are relevant here.

Greek Text for comparison should be the 1550/51 version of Stephens(Estienne) [Textus Receptus] also versions 1860 Scrivener or Cura P.Wilson.

Canon of the Old and New Testaments by Alexander (Princeton)

All Books by George Stanley Faber (watch for other fabers)

All books by Robert D. Wilson

All Books by R.A. Anderson

Sources of the Koran by Sir William Muir is significant in Textual Criticism concerning Apocryphal and Islamic literature, though not always in other contexts.

# PREFACE.

οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει.—1 Cor. iv. 20.

... ἕκαστος δὲ βλέπω πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ.—1 Cor. iii. 10.

ὁ δὲ λοιπὸν ζητεῖται ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις ἵνα πιστός τις εὐρεθῇ.—1 Cor. iv. 2.

1. It is high time that the bubble of codex B should be pricked.

It had not occurred to me to write what follows until recently. I had thought that time would cure the extraordinary Hortian heresy, but when I found that after a silence of twenty years my suggestion that Hort's theories were disallowed today only provoked a denial from a scholar and a critic who has himself disavowed a considerable part of the readings favoured by Hort † it seemed time to write a consecutive account of the crooked path pursued by the MS B, which—from ignorance I trow—most people still confuse with purity and “neutrality.”

I proceed to “name” the aforesaid scholar, since he has challenged me. Dr. A. Souter began a review of my ‘Genesis of the Versions’ by saying that—“*It is the business of a critic first to destroy his enemy's position before he seeks to build up his own.*”

He ended by expressing gratitude for my collations of MSS as such, but added some very strong advice to hold my tongue as regarded commenting on the evidence so painfully accumulated, which he and others would use—but which I must not use or discuss. He said: “*We cannot afford to do without his valuable cooperation in New Testament textual criticism, but would suggest that he confine his energies to the collection and accurate presentation of material, and leave theorizing to others, at least meantime.*”

I refuse to be bound by such advice. I demand a fair hearing on a subject very near my heart, and with which by close attention for many years I have tried to make myself sufficiently acquainted to be able and qualified to discuss it with those few who have pursued a parallel course of study.

I present therefore an indictment against the MS B and against Westcott and Hort, subdivided into hundreds of separate counts. I do

---

† When this was written I believed that the Revised text to which Dr. Souter added some critical apparatus (published by the Clarendon Press in 1910) really represented his views as to the text. He informs me, however, that I am mistaken, and that he favours practically the whole text of Hort. Yet I prefer to allow to stand what I have written above, because Dr. Souter withholds in his notes in certain places (e.g. John xiii. 18 as to *τίνας pro οὓς*) the evidence of B *al.* upon which the readings of Hort were founded, and which the Revisers rejected in those places. The inference is obvious and almost indubitable that Dr. Souter must agree with the Revisers against Westcott and Hort in such places, or he would have given the alternative readings and the evidence for them in his notes.

not believe that the jurymen who will ultimately render a verdict have ever had the matter presented to them formally, legally, and in proper detail.

A comparative study of the Versions has been made but by few. Tischendorf did the best he could, but often neglects a Latin MS or the Aethiopic version when, for instance, standing alone with **N**. In such cases **N** appears to be the only witness, but has support. Mr. Horner's apparatus in his edition of the Gospels in the Sahidic dialect has some improvements on Tischendorf, but he has also overlooked many important little keys.

I have endeavoured to bring out other points of vital interest for a full and complete understanding of the matter.

Many errors of omission may yet be found in my own apparatus. I do not ask the critics to favour me with corrections of manifest slips, or of a printer's error of a Greek accent, or as to whether Schepps is spelled Schepps or Schepss. I ask for a categorical answer count by count to my indictment of B. I ask for intelligent discussion of how it would have been possible for an "Antiochian" revision to have displaced certain B readings had they been really genuine. And I ask for a proper explanation of certain Egyptian and Alexandrian features amounting to clear revision in the text of B and **N**, if we are to divorce them from Alexandria and Egyptian soil where they belong properly.

I had not intended simultaneously to write out the history of **N**, which I have sketched in Part II. But this was early forced upon me, and will I think materially contribute to a proper grasp of the problems involved.

Dr. Souter has said that "it is the business of a critic first to destroy his enemy's position," but I beg to observe that the enemy, under deepest cover of night, has already abandoned several important positions. And there is such a thing as a flanking movement which compels retirement or surrender without striking a more direct blow in front. Thirty years and more have been allowed for them to retire in good order. If the finale is to be a rout and a "sauve qui peut," it is not owing to lack of patience on the part of the other side. But it will be owing to apathy, to unfaithfulness, to pride, to incomplete examination of documentary evidence, and to an overweening haste to establish the "true" text without due regard to scientific foundations.

If now I throw some bombs into the inner citadel, it is because from that Keep there continues to issue a large amount of ignorant iteration of Hort's conclusions, without one particle of proof that his foundation theory is correct.

It is impossible to reproduce or restore the text of Origen. Origen had no settled text.† A reference to the innumerable places where he is

---

† This is strong language, but compare Mark xi. 1/12, where *Origen* at different times employs two different recensions without seeming to observe it.

upon *both* sides of the question, as set forth in detail herein, will show this clearly. Add the places where he is in direct opposition to **N** and **B**, and we must reconsider the whole position, pending which a return to Wetstein's text might be an improvement.

I ask for a patient hearing of what must take a considerable time in the telling (although I have condensed the matter as much as seemed possible), while I proceed to sing the Death-song of **B** as a neutral text.

2. Now as to the supposed Antioch revision, and as to an Egyptian revision, history is very silent. I know of no book where the matter is succinctly sketched except 'The Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek,' by Dr. Swete (1900). Here (p. 78 *seq*) Dr. Swete distinguished between the later and the earlier Hesychius, and seems to accept as probable that Phileas and Hesychius (the earlier) at the end of the third century, with or without Pachymius and Theodore, engaged in Egypt in a revision of the Greek New Testament scriptures as well as of the Old Testament. And it is to be assumed that St. Jerome was referring to this Hesychius as to a revision possibly of both Testaments. The Decret. Gelasii to which Dr. Swete refers (p. 79) speaks of an Hesychius, but of whom it is difficult to judge as the date of the Decr. is uncertain.† But whether the labours of the earlier Hesychius and of Phileas may not be involved in the charge, some things in the following pages seem to suggest, and possibly the labours of the several men of the name of Hesychius were somewhat confused in later times.

As to Lucian, with or without Dorotheus, and his presumed revision of the Scriptures at Antioch, probable as this may be, we are again in a difficulty. This Lucian died in 312, but he is not the same Lucian [circa 120-190] to whom Origen [186-253] refers as having probably altered the Scriptures (*contra Celsum* ii. ch. xxvii). "Now I know of no others who have altered the Gospel save the followers of Marcion and those of Valentinus and I think also those of Lucian."

To Lucian and Hesychius together Jerome refers in his letter to Damasus: "*Praetermitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum adserit perversa contentio quibus utique nec in (toto) veteri instrumento post septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit nec in novo profuit emendasse cum multarum gentium linguis scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt.*" This certainly refers to the second Lucian and probably to the first Hesychius.

In his *praefatio ad Paralip.* Jerome says: "*Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt; quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius*

---

† As to the date of the *Decretum Gelasii* itself see article by F. C. Burkitt in 'Journal of Theol. Studies' for April 1913, p. 470.

et Pamphilus vulgaverunt: totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat....” Here he is certainly only referring to the O.T. directly.

Whether or not Hesychius i and Phileas are the ones responsible for the Egyptian revision of the *New Testament*, there was evidently such a revision, which is what the following pages are concerned to exhibit.

I do not deny that Lucian ii perhaps also revised the New Testament about the same time (circa 290 A.D.) at Antioch, and that therefore, as Hort allowed, the Textus receptus foundation is synchronous as to age with the other forms of text.

But I do not see how it is possible to accord to the **NB** group any general neutral base as against the other text, or to see any way out of the difficulty except an assumption that the **NB** group represent this Egyptian and Hesychian (i) revision, with traces here and there, it is true, of a foundation common to an earlier form shared by both Antiochian and Egyptian bases before either revision took place.

The principal point involved is: “*Who is responsible for the greater revising?*” And the answer seems decided that the **NB** group should be given the palm. Otherwise we cannot explain the facts. For it is inconceivable that Lucian ii or anyone else removed what are considered such *good* readings in **NB** as:

Matthew vi. 7. υποκριται (*pro εθνικοι*)

xvii. 15. κακος εχει (*pro κακος πασχει*)

xix. 4. κτισας (*pro ποιησας*)

xx. 34. ομματος (*pro οφθαλμων*)

xxii. 10. νυμφων (*pro γαμος*)

Mark v. 36. παρακουσας (*pro ακουσας*)

vii. 4. ραντισωνται (*pro βαπτισωνται*)

x. 16. κατευλογει (*pro ευλογει*)

Luke xi. 33. φως (*pro φεγγος*)

xii. 28. αμφιαζει (*pro αμφιεννυσι*)

xii. 56. ουκ οιδατε δοκιμαζειν (*pro ου δοκιμαζετε*)

xxii. 55. περιφαντων (*pro αφαντων*)

xxiv. 33. ηθροισμενους (*pro συνηθροισμενους*)

John iv. 15. διερχωμαι (*pro ερχωμαι*)

xi. 57. εντολας (*pro εντολην*)

xix. 41. ην τεθειμενος (*pro ετεθη*)

On this ground alone then, however pure or impure, neutral or expanded, may be the narrative in the Antiochian or Constantinopolitan text, it shows a base in such places free from the “improvements” made in Egypt.

Until this matter be disproved, and I see not how it can be done away with, we must refuse to allow the priority or purity of the **NB** recension over that of Constantinople and Antioch as to genuine neutral base.

My thesis is then that it was B and **N** and their forerunners with *Origen* who revised the "Antioch" text. And that, although there is an older base than either of these groups, the "Antioch" text is purer in many respects, if not "better," and is nearer the original base than much of that in vogue in Egypt.

I have recently published a fresh collation of Evan 157. I was anxious to do this for several reasons, but I was surprised at the result; principally because I found that the text of the MS had, like so many others, passed through Egypt at some time and become imbued with a good many coptic readings which are of such a nature that they could only have been obtained through the agency of a graeco-coptic document.

This matter illustrates our point very thoroughly and very decidedly. Where 157 opposes **NB** and coterie we are to suppose that upon its return to Constantinople the archetype of 157 was subjected to a rigorous comparison with a standard which caused the removal of all the "good" readings of the **NB** group! Such a thing is unthinkable. On the contrary, 157 is a good example of a text full of "old" readings and having a very ancient base, yet not "improved" on the principles of **NB**. But all this will develop as we proceed with our examination.

Dr. Souter has said further of me in his review of my 'Genesis of the Versions,' "*It is rhetoric and perhaps something worse to say that Hort's whole classification is now admitted to be wrong* (p. 387). *Mr. Hoskier would find it difficult to prove this.*"

In reply to this, I will only say that in the same volume under review I had quoted Burkitt and others on this very point, and given their own language. But I will be still more precise here and subjoin some of the remarks which can be gathered from a rapid glance at the writings of Kenyon, Burkitt, and Turner, without mentioning Merx.

"There remain the 'Neutral' and 'Alexandrian' groups, *if we accept Hort's classification.*"—Crum and Kenyon, J.T.S. vol. i. p. 432, 'Of the middle-Egyptian graeco-coptic fragment.'

"Tischendorf's text is, in my own opinion, *right in many places where the text of Hort is wrong*; but it is right, as it were, rather because a sort of divining instinct, the result of his long acquaintance with his material, led him to the truth, than because he had really, at least in the sense that Hort and von Soden have done, argued out his principles."—C. H. Turner, J.T.S. vol. xi. p. 183, 'Historical Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the N.T.'

[But Tischendorf "argues out his principles" on every other page of his N.T., and although he often follows B against **N**, it is **N** as a "neutral" text that he is following just where Turner no doubt agrees with his critical acumen.—H.C.H.]

"Some few of these 'interpolations' may possibly not be interpolations at all, but portions of the true text which have fallen out of **NB**. . . .

"As soon as the Latinity of the 'Italian' group is studied without special reference to the type of Greek text represented by the various mss, it becomes at once evident that Dr. Hort's classification is unsatisfactory. The first blow to it was dealt by Mr. White in his edition of *q*. . . ."—F. C. Burkitt, *Texts and Studies*, vol. iv. No. 3, 'The Old Latin and the Itala,' pp. 52 and 55.

"The text of Westcott and Hort is practically the text of **NB**. The Old Syriac sometimes supports the true text of the **NB** family, where **N** singly or **B** singly deserts the family to side with a later variation; is it not therefore possible, and indeed likely, that in some instances **N** and **B** may both have deserted the reading which they ought to have followed, and that they and not *S* (= *syr sin*) are inconsistent? That **N** and **B** occasionally" [over 3,000 real differences between **N** and **B** are recorded in the Gospels alone!—H.C.H.] "are inconsistent with themselves appears certain in several places. Carefully as **B** is written, now and again it presents an ungrammatical reading, which proves on examination to be the fragment of a rival variant. Thus at Matt. xxiii. 26. . . . Other instances are . . . . *In all these instances*" [Matt. xxi. 31, xxiii. 26, xxvii. 17, Luke xi. 33, xix. 37] "*B presents us with what is evidently a doctored text.*"—F. C. Burkitt, 'Ev. da Mepharreshe,' vol. ii. pp. 233/4.

Now in the following pages I submit a vast number of other instances where **B** has a doctored text, plainly, indubitably doctored. Hort and my side cannot *both* be right in their estimate of this "neutral" text. I claim merely that it is *not* neutral, and may not be followed unless standing with strong independent company apart from the other usual "Egyptian" supporters. I had thought von Soden agreed with me, but his new text is very eclectic, and I wish to submit my side of the question independently of his views. I have had no correspondence with him on the subject. Adalbert Merx is decidedly on my side.

[NOTE.—As to Hesychius referred to on p. iii we have really to distinguish between four men of this name (and possibly a fifth may lurk between them).

Hesychius *circa* 200 in Egypt.

Hesychius the Alexandrian and lexicographer *ca.* 380.

Hesychius of Jerusalem stated as *ob.* 609 by Gregory, but in Gallandius vol. xi. *Præf.* p. vii as *ob.* in 433 or 436. To this man is attributed the Concordance or harmony republished (?) by Severus in 513.

Hesychius of Miletus *circa* 540, author of an Onomasticon and Chronicon.]



# INTRODUCTION.

Πάντα δοκιμάζετε · τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.—1 Thess. v. 21.

Γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι.—Apelles Eriph.

Origen Joh

Σοὺ γὰρ, φησὶν [ὁ Κύριος], ἄνθρωπε, τοὺς λόγους μου ὡς ἀργύριον ἐπὶ τραπεζιτῶν καὶ ὡς χρήματα δοκιμάσαι.—Clem<sup>hom</sup>.

I suppose that it will readily be conceded that C. H. Turner is without question the most brilliant writer on Textual Criticism today. It is always a pleasure to read him, and to be carried along in his racy and well-balanced style, which shows large mastery of the historical side of the problem as far as we have gathered it to-day. But there are certain weak points in his argument. I refer particularly to his article in the J.T.S. for January 1910,† which I think shows a smaller

† 'Historical Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.' V: The Languages of the Early Church; (B) Syriac and the first Syriac Gospels.

Turner's two examples in textual criticism (Matt. i. 16 and Luke xiv. 5) are distinguished, as usual, by a perfectly lucid view of matters which would surely lead him a long way as a helpful master in the science if he would collate certain texts with each other and get at the many suggestions for the origin of error which abound when the documents themselves are consulted. Thus, as to *ovos* and *vios* in Luke xiv. 5 the origin of the change may perhaps be referred merely to the propinquity of other words with similar commencement or termination. If he will turn up the Codex Sinaiticus the following will be found:

ΣΕΝΚΑΙΑΠΟΚΡΙΘΙ<sup>ο</sup>  
ΠΡΟCΑΥΤΟ<sup>Υ</sup>ΝΕΙΠΕΝ  
ΤΙΝΟCΥΜΩΝΟΝ<sup>ο</sup>  
ΗΒΟΥCΕΙCΦΡΕΑΡΠΕ

At first sight it looks as if the corrector had misplaced YC (YIOC) over the wrong ON, but he is apparently correcting *αυτον* to *αυτους*. It is possible that a similar change where YC was written by mistake over the wrong ON (in ONOC) led to the trouble.

Now if we turn to B: ΑΥΤΟΝΚΑΙΑΠΕΛΥCΕΝ  
ΚΑΙΠΡΟCΑΥΤΟΥCΕΙΠΕ  
ΤΙΝΟCΥΜΩΝΥΙΟCΗΒΟΥC  
ΕΙCΦΡΕΑΡΠΕCΕΙΤΑΙΚ

we find *vios* comes below *αυτους*, as in N *ovos* comes below *αυτον*. Hence there was a possibility of *error oculi* in both places, making for *vios* in one and *ovos* in the other. A faint or interlined original therefore may be the cause of the trouble, as we see from *syr cw*'s conflation.

Note further that AS and U have ΟΥΙΟC, retaining an O, while D's *προβαρον* is faithfully reproduced in d OVIS (*ovis et bobis*). We may even hazard that OVIS might have influenced ONOC in that dim period when "Western" and "Alexandrian" texts were linking up.

acquaintance with the testimony of the MSS themselves than I expected to find in his writings.

On p. 183/4 he says "Hort was the last and perhaps the ablest of a long line of editors of the Greek Testament, commencing in the eighteenth century, who very tentatively at first, but quite ruthlessly in the end, threw over the later in favour of the earlier Greek MSS: AND THAT ISSUE WILL NEVER HAVE TO BE TRIED AGAIN. In Hort's hands this preference for the earlier MSS was pushed to its most extreme form...."

This sentence seems to me to lack a grasp of what the testimony of the later documents *is* (as evidenced by the contents of those which we know) and what the testimony *may be* of those which are yet unexamined, of which of course there are hundreds and hundreds.

To take Rendel Harris' 892, published in 1890, or Schmidtke's Paris nat<sup>97</sup> for example (the latter variously known as Scrivener 743, or Gregory 579, or von Soden ε 376, *olim* Reg 2861, *olim* Colbert 5258) which was published in 1903, we find texts which at first sight are in large accord with **NBLV**. Yet if we examine them more closely, as I have had occasion to do in reading them a score of times, we find a strange state of things. For if, where they accord with **NBLV**, they are supporting the genuine reading, what are they doing when they are aberrant, as we find on every page? What are they doing when they accord with the "Antioch" side, or with 28 or 157 or the Syriac alone, or when they have their own peculiar way of exhibiting the text? If the question be *closed*, as Turner says: "*and that issue will never have to be tried again,*" how are we to judge of the issues where **N** and **B** are opposed, in over 3,000 places? for he says on p. 183 just previously: "Tischendorf's text is, in my own opinion, right in many places *where the text of Hort is wrong....*" It is in such places that I claim the testimony of 892 or Paris<sup>97</sup> as invaluable for "control." A deep study of the phenomena involved in this is imperative, for the question which arises in such cases is whether this text antedates the common base of **NB** or not.†

Turner has a reference to an Oxyrynchus papyrus which claims our attention next. In this connection let it be understood that the oldest documents in profane literature unearthed by Grenfell and Hunt are

---

† It is well to bear in mind at all times that the questions at issue are not those of the xvi<sup>th</sup> century versus those of the iv<sup>th</sup>. It is a question of the MSS of the iv<sup>th</sup> + LV of viii/ix + RTQ of vi/v [WX with D occupying a position midway] against a large band of other uncials of nearly the same dates. The textual questions involved are all back of the iv<sup>th</sup> cent. In other words it is not a question of Turner's "later MSS in favour of the earlier Greek MSS," but as to who was right A.D. 125-400, when these questions arose. Turner is misstating the case. Hort did not do this. He recognised the Textus receptus as being quite as old as 350 A.D. or older.

often woefully inferior in places to more modern documents of the same writings, and often very corrupt.†

On pp. 185-6 Turner writes: "The discovery, since Hort wrote, of a papyrus leaf containing most of the first chapter of St. Matthew in a text closely agreeing, even in spelling of proper names, with the text of B, *may be fairly held to carry back the whole B text of the Gospels into the third century.*"

Why "the **WHOLE B text**"? I wonder. Does Turner not know that it is unallowable for a serious textual critic so to express himself. The four Gospels are most frequently in mss found to be of different recensions although bound together. After the many Christian persecutions during which the fragile documents of the Faith were in jeopardy every hour, it seems that it was difficult to obtain the four Gospels together to be recopied. Indeed—judging from certain early Syriac documents in the British Museum, as well as from the varying order of the Gospels as recopied and bound—it was the practice in the early centuries to carry one or two Gospels bound together. Hence, after the stress of a persecution had abated, and a Church copy of the Tetra-evangelion was required, it was often unconsciously made up of different recensions. Therefore, because B accords in *St. Matthew* with the Oxyrynchus papyrus, No. 2 (plate i) vol. i. 1898, it does not necessarily follow that the same applies to the *other* three Gospels.‡ This in first place. But, secondly, does B find the support claimed by Turner here (and by Burkitt, 'Introduction to Barnard's Clement of Alexandria,' Texts and Studies, vol. v. No. 5), or is not this exaggerated? The biblical piece referred to is the merest fragment, a veritable trifle, containing Matt. i. 1-9, 12, 14-20. As to date G. and H. say: "There is no likelihood of its being subsequent to the beginning of the fourth century, and it may with greater probability be assigned to the third." Shall we call it A.D. 275 then? This only carries the B text of this portion back fifty or sixty years or so anyhow. After a collation, G. and H. sum up thus: "The papyrus clearly belongs to the same class as the Sinaitic and Vatican codices, and has no Western or Syrian proclivities. Except in cases where it has a reading peculiar to itself alone, the papyrus always agrees with those two mss where they are in agreement. Where they differ, the papyrus does not consistently follow either of them, but is somewhat nearer the Vatican codex, especially in matters of spelling, though in one important case (τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) it agrees with the codex Sinaiticus."

---

† Note also the following opinions: "There is this peculiarity about the mss of the treatise *De statu animae* [of Claudius Mamertus] that their value is in almost inverse ratio to their age."—Sanday, 'Classical Review,' Feb. 1888.

"However, as we shall see later, age is no certain criterion of value."—L. J. M. Bebb, 'Studia Biblica,' vol. ii. No. 5, p. 201 (1890).

‡ Obs. *Soden's* ms 050 with **N** in Matt. and John, with BD in Mark, with B in Luke.

Now hear Dr. Burkitt before we proceed (*op. cit.* pp. viii, x/xi): "Mr. Barnard has paid a longer and less hurried visit than Dean Burgon's flying call. He has copied out all the marked places in Clement's bible as far as the Gospels and Acts are concerned. . . . Before actually examining Clement's quotations let us for a moment consider what we might have expected to find. Since the publication of the Revised Version and Dean Burgon's strictures on it, investigations and discoveries have been made which bear directly on the subject. The general result is quite clear. Whether  $\aleph$  and B are, as Dean Burgon has it, 'two false witnesses,' B, at least, can no longer be regarded as a mere 'curiosity.' There can now be little doubt that this MS represents in the Gospels with great accuracy the type of text current in Egypt from the middle of the third century A.D., although B itself may very well have been written at Caesarea in the famous library of Pamphilus. The Egyptian proclivities of B have been well illustrated by three comparatively recent publications. . . . The most striking discovery of all remains. In the Oxyrynchus papyrus fragment of St. Matthew, discovered and edited by Grenfell and Hunt, we have at last an undoubted piece of a third-century Gospel MS. The fragment is older, probably by a century, than any known MS of any part of the New Testament, and most fortunately covers a passage where the variants are extremely well marked (*viz.* *Matt.* i. 1-20). What, then, does this voice from the dead say? Does it support Burgon or Hort? The answer is most decided. It sides with  $\aleph$  and B. With  $\aleph$  and B (and of course 'Westcott and Hort') it has *Boes* † for *Booz*, *Iobed* for *Obed*, *Asaph* ‡ for *Asa*. Nor is this agreement confined to the spelling of the names of Jewish kings, seeing that it has  $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  in *Matt.* i. 18 (not  $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ), a reading characteristic enough of B and Dr. Hort to draw forth three pages of Dean Burgon's indignation. Other readings of B similarly attested by the new fragment are  $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota$  for  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota$  (*ver* 19) and the omission of  $\delta\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  in *ver* 6, and of  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  in *ver* 18. Nor does the papyrus give support to 'Western' texts any more than to the 'Received Text.' Both in *vv.* 16 and 18 it rejects the readings of Codex Bezae and its allies. In one word, it is just such a document as Dr. Hort would have expected it to be." So far Burkitt.

Commenting on this, the first thing which attracts our attention is the notice of  $-\sigma\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  in *ver* 6, followed by the statement that "the papyrus gives no support to 'Western' texts." Yet, the omission of  $\delta\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  is found in the *Latins* §  $g_1\ g_2\ k\ gat\ dim$  and *vulgates* JMT with

† = Coptic, as the Coptic in Luke iii. 32, but there not NB.

‡ Consult Salmon, 'Some Thoughts on Textual Criticism,' as to this.

§ I take this opportunity of correcting a mistake in my 'Gen. of the Versions,' vol. ii. p. 200, where I said "[*non Oxyr*]" for this omission. G. and H. professed to give a collation with the Text. recept. and *W-H*, but were silent as to verse 6, and I failed to compare the original text.

*Auct op imp.* However this is a small matter. There is practically no opportunity in these few verses for much variation. What I object to is the generalisation as to the conformity of B to the Oxyrynchus fragment from these very few verses. As a matter of fact the agreement is overrated and quite spasmodic. Here is a collation of B and the fragment:

COLLATION OF B WITH *Oxyr*<sup>2</sup>.

## AGREEMENT.

## DISAGREEMENT.

Matthew.

i. 1

3 ΖΑΡΕ

4

5 ΒΟΕC

(but so also **N** *copt k*)

ΙΩΒΗΔ

( " " **NCD** *copt al.*)

6 -ο βασιλευς

( " " **NΓ** *al. et latt*<sup>1</sup>)

CΟΛΟΜΩΝΑ

( " " most MSS)

7

7/8 ΑCΑΦ

( " " **NCD** *al.*)8/9 ΟΖΕΙΑΝ·ΟΖΕΙΑC (but papyrus is faint  
and *pr loco* looks like ΟΖΙΑΝ)9<sup>b</sup>-12<sup>a</sup> missing

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 ΓΕΝΕCIC (but so also **NCP** *SZD*)-γap ( " " **N** *C\*Z etc*)

19

20

Oxyr.  $\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{Y}}$ 

B YIOY

" ΔΑΥΙΑ

B ΔΑΥΕΙΑ

" ΑΜΜΙΝΑΔΑB *bis*B ΑΜΕΙΝΑΔΑB *bis*" ΔΑΥΙΑ *bis*B ΔΑΥΕΙΑ *bis*

" ΘΗC ΟΥΡΕΙΟΥ

B ΘΗC ΤΟΥ  
ΟΥΡΕΙΟΥ" ΑΒ[ΕΙ]Α *prim*

B ΑΒΙΑ

" ΑΒΕΙΑ *sec*

B ΑΒΙΑ

7/8 ΑCΑΦ ( " " **NCD** *al.*)8/9 ΟΖΕΙΑΝ·ΟΖΕΙΑC (but papyrus is faint  
and *pr loco* looks like ΟΖΙΑΝ)9<sup>b</sup>-12<sup>a</sup> missing

12

" ΕΓΕ[ΝΗCΕΝ] *prim* B ΓΕΝΝΑ *prim* †" *illeg*

B ΤΟΝ CΕΛΑΘΙΗΛ

" *illeg*B CΕΛΑΘΙΗΛ ΔΕ  
ΓΕΝΝΑ †13/14 Oxyr. *illeg* but:**N** ΑΒΙΟΥΤ (*cf lat*)Oxyr. ΜΑΘΘΑΝ *bis*B ΜΑΘΘΑΝ *sic bis*

" ΙΩCΗΦ

B ΤΟΝ ΙΩCΗΦ

" ΓΕΝΕΑΙ

B ΑΙ ΓΕΝΕΑΙ

" ΔΑΥΙΑ *prim*B ΔΑΥΕΙΑ *prim*" ΔΑΥΙΑ *sec*B ΔΑΥΕΙΑ *sec*" ΙΔ *ter*B ΔΕΚΑΤΕCCAΡΕC  
*ter*"  $\overline{\text{IY}} \overline{\text{XY}}$ B  $\overline{\text{XY}} \overline{\text{IY}}$ 

" ΔΕΙΓΜΑ[Τ]ΕΙCΑΙ ‡ B ΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙCΑΙ

" ΔΑΥΙΑ

B ΔΑΥΕΙΑ

† Cf *Protev*<sup>10c</sup> ad Luc i. 31.

‡ Burkitt claims this as against παραδειγματισαι but it is not absolutely clear whether the papyrus had παρα. G. and H. merely say "there is barely room for παρα at the end of the line."

Now this more complete tabulation is rather interesting. If it proves Burkitt's case as against Burgon then "figures lie." I do not wish to draw any conclusions against B from the comparison, but as to the few agreements supporting the views of any particular school of criticism the matter is simply absurd. Far more important than ΒΟΕC

ΙΩΒΗΑ or -ο βασιλευς is the Oxyr opposition to B's γεννᾶ in *ver* 12. And to dogmatise about a matter of 17 verses is unworthy of serious consideration when the real weighty matters are outside of the range of comparison. This "voice from the dead" no more supports Hort than Burgon. The questions at issue do not turn on spelling (and here even the deductions drawn are wrong) but on what is the "true" text: whether Lucian's revision (if it equate "Antioch") or Hesychius' revision (if it equate "Egypt") is the right text. To close the matter, as Turner suggests, is to sit down and be content with NBLTWΨ as representing merely an "Egyptian" agreement *inter se*. But, as I have said, what are we to do when they differ? We are certainly not going to waver simply between N and B. That would be a *reductio ad absurdum*. I write this feeling most earnestly that we have much to learn from the junior documents, and Turner is so capable a man that I dislike to read his dictum "and that issue will never have to be tried again"—that is to say the issue between the later and the earlier (= NB) MSS. It is not so. The issue is not decided as to whether the "revision at Antioch" or the "revision in Egypt" represents the best text. In each case it is to be presumed that the revisers thought they were perpetuating the "best" text; but whether the "true" text (as the self-appointed arbiters † of the text of the N.T. since Hort are prone to write) remains a question still absolutely *sub judice*.

Before leaving Turner's article a most important matter must be referred to. He writes (pp. 204/5): "The first stages, then, of the history of the Syriac New Testament are represented for us by a Gospel Harmony constructed out of a Roman Greek MS of the Gospels in the third quarter of the second century..."

Observe, a *Roman-Greek* MS, but by this he does not mean a *graecolatin* (for on p. 184 he accepts the common view of the Latin: "the *first stratum* of the old Latin version in the African MSS *k* and *e*"), but he means only a Greek MS of Roman provenance. So much then is definitely accepted today, *i.e.* that Tatian's harmony was based on a *Greek* MS used by him *in Rome* and no doubt carried away with him *circa* A.D. 175. Hence, then, the matters which we find in agreement between Tatian and certain "Western" authorities. Good, so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. In the first place, we find in Tatian many cases where his text agrees with the *Latin*, not the "Western" Greek, but only with the Latin. How does this occur if the Latin was non-

---

† In the general scheme of textual criticism the examples given by Hort to sustain his theory of families are painfully inadequate. "Syrian" or later readings are found abounding in certain documents like Paris<sup>97</sup> side by side with what are probably *judice Hort* "pre-Syrian," yet the text does not carry signs of a revision which made an eclectic text. This document when carefully read bears evidence of being a whole before A.D. 400, and the "Syrian" part of this text cannot be separated from a "pre-Syrian."

existent in Tatian's day in Rome? The answer has been given that it is the Diatessaron which has so largely influenced the Latin. I deny this in a large measure and look on the contrary for the origin of this sympathy to a Latin-Greek *bilingual* at Rome before A.D. 175 and not only to a "Roman-Greek ms."

If I am correct, this destroys the theory, accepted by Turner purely on historical grounds (but how silent is history as to most of the matters involved!), that the separate Gospels in Syriac followed and did not precede the Harmony. Because at the outset it seems to be a fact that the Latin did not influence the Syriac, but the Syriac the Latin. There is a priority of action of Syriac on Latin as against Latin on Syriac.

Therefore if there was a Graeco-Latin in Rome in 175 A.D., there must have been a Syriac still earlier.

Next, if to the Diatessaron we are to attribute reflex action on Latin documents, how are we to account for the cases where the whole mass of Latin documents (widely separated geographically as to their recopying and revision) together oppose the Syriacs?

I have stated before and repeat here that there is every evidence remaining in certain Greek and Latin documents, taken in conjunction with the varying elements in the existing mss of *syr vet*, *syr pesh*, *syr hier* and the *diatess arab* (not to speak of *pers*, which combines elements of all the Syriacs but principally of *syr vet*), to show that a *lost* or *hidden* Syriac precedes them; and that this lost Syriac influenced both Latin and Greek documents, when running concurrently in the early part of the second century, and before Tatian's Diatessaron was planned. I wish to see this disproved if possible, not by the historical method, but by a reply based on documentary evidence, before surrendering the position to which my study of the documents has led me.

The diatessaron alone cannot be responsible for the spasmodic agreement between Latin and Syriac documents, because the various Latin documents often as a whole oppose the Syriac documents as a whole. Attention is directed to this in many passages coming under discussion in the following pages, and Dr. Vogels is requested to observe this carefully. Note Dr. Meinertz' review of Vogels in *Theologische Revue* 1913, No. 18, p. 538 col. 1, as to Luke xxiv. 12, 36, 40: "Solche Beobachtungen weisen auf Schwierigkeiten hin, die noch der Lösung harren."

# CONTENTS.

## PART I.

	PAGES
Preface . . . . .	i-vi
Introduction . . . . .	vii-xiii
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
I. Hort's critical principles . . . . .	1-13
II. B in St. Matthew's Gospel . . . . .	14-71
Editing—Solecisms—Latin sympathy—Coptic sympathy— Syriac traces—Form—Synonyms—Grammatical changes (32-44)—Harmonistic—General improvement (48-68)— Conflict with Origen.	
III. B in St. Mark's Gospel . . . . .	72-125
General—Editing—Solecisms—Latin sympathy—Coptic— Latin and Coptic—Syriac—Form—Synonyms—Homoioteleu- ton—Grammatical changes (91-104)—Harmonistic—General improvement (107-114)—Diction of Mark—Improvement and Change without improvement—Opposition to the harder reading—Conflict with Origen.	
IV. Concerning the Latin Version of St. Mark . . . . .	126-139
General—As to D <sup>sr</sup> <i>a</i> and <i>d</i> —As to <i>b</i> —Testimony of the Catacombs—As to <i>c</i> —The Irish texts—Base of St. Mark— Mark vi. 36—Retranslation in W—In others.	
V. Two or more Greek recensions of St. Mark . . . . .	140-171
Selected examples of varieties of readings and renderings throughout the Gospel.	
VI. Concerning the Latin base of St. Mark. . . . .	172-194
Further remarks as to the unity of <i>d</i> and the <i>Itala</i> as a whole—As to difficulties at i. 41, iv. 6, iv. 15, vi. 31, xiv. 72, ii. 7, ii. 12—As to the Greek article—General.	
VII. Concerning the Greek of D and the testimony of the Fathers in St. Mark's Gospel . . . . .	195-206
Concluding remarks—The methods of D <sup>sr</sup> —Patristic testimony—Clement of Alexandria (x. 22 <i>seq.</i> )—Tertullian (xiv. 13)—Justin (viii. 31).	
Map of Courses of Transmission of St. Mark's Gospel . . . . .	207
VIII. B in St. Luke's Gospel . . . . .	208-298
Editing—The longer text in B—Solecisms—Latin sympathy —(N.T. use of <i>ως</i> 221/5)—Coptic—Latin and Coptic—Syriac traces—Syr-Lat against Coptic—Syr-Lat and Coptic—Syr- Copt against Latin—Synonyms—Form—Grammatical changes (242-263)—Genitive before the noun—Harmonistic— "Neutral" "Pre-Syrian" "Pre-Alexandrian" misnomers— General improvement, <i>etc.</i> (272-297)—Conflict with Origen.	



CHAPTER	PAGES
IX. B in St. John's Gospel . . . . .	299-405
Editing — Solecisms — Latin sympathy — Coptic — The corrector of B—Coptic and Latin—Syriac traces—On <i>εκεινος</i> in St. John—Form—Synonyms—Homoioteleuton and homoiocarteton—Compound and simple verbs, on <i>ερχομαι</i> and <i>διερχομαι</i> (344-347)—Grammatical changes (348-363)—Order—Concerning ix. 21 and the Diatess.—Hopelessness of considering B neutral—Harmonistic—Conflation—General improvement (374-396)—Change without improvement—Indeterminate—Conflict with Origen.	
X. Epilogue . . . . .	406-487
Luke xxii. 43/44. Medical language of St. Luke—As to <i>γενομενος</i> and <i>εγενετο</i> —xxiii. 34 new evidence for and against—As to <i>Œcumenius</i> —Hesychius and Origen—Dean Burgou's position—Codex B outside the Gospels (416-419)—Patristic testimony—Finesse of B—"Higher" and "Lower" criticism—Further test of "Neutral" text applied to second-century witnesses, Aristides, Theodotus, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Naasseni, Hippolytus, Marcion, <i>etc.</i> —Eustathius and Antioch—On changing symbols of codices—Singular cursive testimony (435-454)—Von Soden's N.T.—The <i>Κοινή</i> (453-460)—As to Merx, Ramsay and Soden—Burkitt, Merx and Vogels—The verdict—Hortian heresy—Other pseudo-scientific heresies, Robinson Smith, Dean Inge on St. Paul, <i>etc.</i> —Conclusion.	
Postscript (on <i>περι</i> and <i>υπερ</i> ) . . . . .	488
General Index . . . . .	489-497

## PART II.—VOL. II.

VARIATIONS BETWEEN *Σ* AND B.

St. Matthew . . . . .	1-57
St. Mark . . . . .	58-112
St. Luke . . . . .	113-195
St. John . . . . .	196-341
Postscript ("Gleanings") . . . . .	343-382
Index of Scriptural Quotations, covering vol. I. and vol. II. :	383-412

"Yet, great as has been my veneration for Hort and my admiration of the good work that he has done, I have never been able to feel that his work was final, and I have disliked the servility with which his history of the text has been accepted, and even his nomenclature adopted, as if now the last word had been said on the subject of New Testament criticism . . . ." (p. 33).

"That which gained Hort so many adherents had some adverse influence with myself—I mean his extreme cleverness as an advocate; for I have felt as if there were no reading so improbable that he could not give good reasons for thinking it to be the only genuine . . . ." (p. 33/4).

"On this account I am not deterred by the general adoption of W-H's decisions from expressing my opinion that their work has too readily been accepted as final, and that students have been too willing to accept as their motto 'Rest and be thankful.' There is no such enemy to progress as the belief that perfection has been already attained." (p. 38).

"In Hort's exposition the student is not taken with him along the path that he himself had followed; he must start with the acceptance of the final result. Consequently one of the first things at which I took umbrage in W-H's exposition was the question-begging nomenclature." (p. 43).

"I strongly feel that Hort would have done better if he had left the old nomenclature undisturbed, and distinguished his neutral text from that which he calls 'Alexandrian' by the names 'early Alexandrian' and 'later Alexandrian.' Names will not alter facts, though they may enable us to shut our eyes to them. . . ." (p. 52).

"Naturally Hort regarded those mss as most trustworthy which give the readings recognized by Origen; and these no doubt were the readings which in the third century were most preferred at Alexandria. Thus Hort's method inevitably led to the exclusive adoption of the Alexandrian text." (p. 53).

"To sum up in conclusion, I have but to express my belief that what Westcott and Hort have restored is the text which had the highest authority in *Alexandria* in the third century, and may have reached that city in the preceding one. It would need but to strike out the double brackets from the so-called non-Western interpolations, and to remove altogether the few passages which W-H reluctantly admitted into their pages with marks of doubt, when we should have a pure Alexandrian text. Their success is due to the fact that W-H investigated the subject as a merely literary problem; and the careful preservation at Alexandria of a text which had reached that city was but a literary problem." (p. 155).

"That W-H should employ the Alexandrian 'use' as their chief guide to the recovery of the original text may be quite right; but that they should refuse a place on their page to anything that has not that authority is an extreme which makes me glad that the Revised New Testament, which so closely follows their authority, has not superseded the Authorized version in our Churches. For, if it had, the result might be that things would be accounted unfit to be read in the churches of the nineteenth century which were read at Rome in the second century, during the lifetime of men who had seen members of the apostolic company who had visited their city." (pp. 157/8).

# PART I.

---

"Hort (p. 171) makes the suggestive remark that documents which have most Alexandrian have also most 'neutral' readings. It is a little surprising that he did not draw the obvious inference that this is because the documents which contain the neutral readings *are* Alexandrian."—Salmon, *op. cit.* p. 52, note.

"However there is nothing that Hort fights more against than the idea that his neutral text can properly be called 'Alexandrian.' He eagerly catches at the notion that B, its principal representative, was written, not at Alexandria, but probably at Rome. The reasons for regarding the text of B as Alexandrian *remain the same no matter where this particular MS chanced to be copied.*"—Salmon, *op. cit.* p. 60.

## CHAPTER I.

### CODEx B.

#### HORT'S CRITICAL PRINCIPLES.

DR. HORT sought for a "neutral" text, uninfluenced by "Western," "Alexandrian," and "Syrian" readings, and claimed to have found it in B alone. This view has been accepted in England, and nearly as much in Germany, although the late Adalbert Merx did his best to discredit B as a foundation text, and to put the matter in the right light to his countrymen. Great has been our loss by the death of Blass and Merx, and more recently still by that of Nestle.

It seems time to call attention to the lack of basis for Hort's theory, because scholars and writers still speak of a "neutral text" (by which B or readings supported by B is practically always implied), whereas the present writer knows of no such text.

There is ample ground for the opposite view that B had already been influenced by the Syriac and the Latin version, besides the peculiarities visible in the B text, many of which are grammatical and some seemingly due to Egyptian surroundings.

Hitherto we have not known fully the history of textual criticism in Greek Egypt, but every important document, including the new W, which has affinity for the B group, ties the matter more and more down to Egyptian soil, and this simplifies the problem. When W and the cursives of the family oppose B we must weigh these places carefully.

Leaving aside the claims made in the Introduction of *W-H*, the principles upon which the text was founded as it left Hort's hands are fixed for ever, and graven in stereotype for us; and those principles are reduced to one rule, viz., to follow B whenever that MS has any support,

be it only the adhesion of *one* other ms. This is seen (in one Gospel for example) in conjunctions of BL *solī* at Luke xi. 12, of BT *solī* at Luke xiii. 27,† of NB *solī* at Luke xviii. 12, xix. 48, of BΔ *solī* at Luke xxi. 24, of BK *solī* at Luke xiv. 1 (square brackets) and of B *fam* 13 *solī* at Luke vi. 42.‡

Further, readings of B absolutely alone are dignified by textual notice. Matt. vii. 18 *ενεγκειν... ποιειν* is read absolutely alone by B (see note on this elsewhere), and in Luke iii. 33 *του αμυναδαβ*, omitted only by B, finds no place in Hort's text; observe also Luke v. 2 *πλοια δυο* order of B alone among Greeks; v. 3 *εκ του πλοιου επιδασκεν* B alone; the omissions by B only of *απ'* Luke xii. 58, of *εν* Luke x. 31, of *προς αυτον* Luke ix. 62 are enclosed in square brackets; or they are given a place in the margin (as if "many ancient authorities read thus") as *σταυρωσαι* Luke xxiii. 23, *θρονηντες* Luke xxiv. 37. Observe also the extraordinary *εις το εν τρυβλιον* Mark xiv. 20 by B alone, forced into Hort's text in square brackets because C\*?? possibly read thus.

In the light of this, had B left out in John xiv. 6 *και η αληθεια* in the threefold claim "I am the way and the truth and the life," which Evan 157 does, it is practically certain that Hort's text would have done so also. Had B added *εντρεπτικη* in Luke xviii. 3 as an attribute of the importunate widow, as does Evan 28, we should surely have found it in Hort's text.§ Had B omitted *εν αυτη τη ωρα* in Luke xii. 12 with 33 and Origen we should have been favoured with this omission. Had B omitted *την* before *πιστιν* in Luke xviii. 8 with D 240 244 we should have been asked so to read. *Soden* adds two fresh cursives for omission.

Had B added *ο ιησους* after *τα θαυμασια α εποησεν* in Matt. xxi. 15, as does Evan 28 with Origen and *syr hier* and *it<sup>pl</sup>* (*a b c e f ff<sup>1,2</sup> g<sup>2</sup> h r<sub>2</sub> μ dim gat Wurz<sup>J</sup> vg<sup>DEQR</sup>*) we should certainly have found it in Hort's text [*d g<sub>1</sub> l q vg<sup>pl</sup>* do not add, but *e* does. Tisch. errs in the N.T. as to this witness]. *Soden* adds δ 30 and ε 1091 for this. Observe Origen and *r<sub>2</sub>* alone omit *εν τω ιερω* in this verse.

Had *W-H* known that *Sod<sup>50</sup>* 604 supported B at Luke viii. 25 for the omission of *και υπακουουσιν αυτω* we should doubtless have lost the

† Such mss can easily be shown to be but *one* in stem. For instance B\*R together alone at Luke v. 30 *εγγονυζαν* for *εγγονυζον*, and again vi. 23 *εν τοις ουρανοις* for *εν τω ουρανω*. For some reason *W-H* do not like this combination. R is the famous v<sup>th</sup> century ms from the Nitrian desert. In the second case the BR combination is supported by *fam* 13 and ten other minuscules and by *e f goth Cypr*.

‡ Many are the places where NB<sup>L</sup> are followed alone, and this also represents but one single tradition.

§ This is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the critical principles which people do not seem to grasp or follow. This would have resulted in perpetuating blunders of two mss *contra mundum*. Many others, probably as grievous, are to be found in the text. It is thereby rendered unfit for serious study as a whole, and must be banished from our class rooms.

clause, especially as *aeth* favours this omission also, and *W-H* must have sought at that time in vain for another Greek witness. The same applies to Luke vi. 26 — *οι πατερες αυτων* B 604 (+ *sah syr sin*), neglected by *W-H*, yet vi. 31 — *και υμεις* B then alone (omitted in *W-H txt*) has support of 604 and Paris<sup>97</sup>. There is absolutely no science in introducing *θροηθεντες* into the margin of Luke xxiv. 37 on the authority of B alone and in neglecting to record in the margin at viii. 25 that B omits *και υπακουουσιν αυτω*, especially as *aeth* shows it is not an accident. For observe that at Luke iii. 8 on the sole authority of B and *Origen* they introduce the order *αξιους καρπους* into their margin. While at x. 1 — *αυτους* B *e Eus* (now supported by 604 and Paris<sup>97</sup> and *Sod*<sup>351</sup>) is not omitted by *W-H*. At vii. 47 + *και ante ολιγ. αγαπα* B<sup>sol</sup> [*negl Hort*] is added by 892 Paris<sup>97</sup>.

I do not want to multiply ad nauseam instances of arbitrary judgement. These remarks should suffice as to definite examples of the unscientific use of the margin as well as of the text whether bracketed or not. For it is to be observed that at Luke ix. 62 *W-H* bracket *προς αυτον* in the text on the sole authority of B; as a matter of fact however 604 omits also (and *sah* 1/3) which they did not know. The whole treatment of such things is entirely unequal. I wish to point out that their intuition in such matters was quite wrong, because a little further in Luke x. 1 they leave *αυτους* alone and do not brand or bracket it although B omits. Yet here B had support from *e Eus*<sup>dem</sup> and now we find that both 604 and Paris<sup>97</sup> also omit. Had Hort known this he would of course have banished it. It is useless for Souter to get up and defend Hort on any specious plea which I may offer him by stating the matter thus. Souter's own text condemns Hort's *method* while he still clings with a curious loyalty to the *man*.†

Further as to *Origen*, observe Luke xviii. 31 *τελειωθησεται* (for *τελεσθησεται*), which is found in Paris<sup>97</sup> 60 *y*<sup>scr</sup> *z*<sup>scr</sup> and some other important cursives, is *Origen's* reading, yet not found in *NB*.

Or as at Luke xxii. 4 where *Orig* reads *οπως* (and *Eus wa*), with the 13 family only, for *το πως* of *NB* and all the rest [except D *d arm πως*; *d* follows D with *quomodo* against *quemadmodum* of the rest].

Or as at Matt. xv. 22 where 1 [*non fam*] and *Origen* read *δεινως* for *κακως*, but not *NB* or any others known (although there may be other cursives); *δεινως* occurs at Matt. viii. 6 and Luke xi. 53.

Or at Matt. xvi. 25 *fin* for *ευησει αυτην* where *Orig Iren* and *fam* 1 33 read *ουτως σωσει αυτην*.

Or as at Luke xxii. 22 where *Origen* (recollecting *εγραψεν περι αυτου* of *Matt Marc*) adds *αυτω* after *τω ωρισμενου* with *sah syr hier, syr cu* [*non sin*] *aeth περι αυτου*. Had B done this we should have been told it was

† Dr. Souter has informed me since this was written that he had nothing to do with the text itself of the Oxford edition of 1910 and that he favors the Hort text practically entire.

Lucan. It is clearly an addition, as *sah* mss are divided among themselves, four for *αυτω*, and one for *περι αυτου*; while *syr sin* by its silence accuses *cu* of harmonizing.

Origen says we must pay attention to the letter of Scripture down to the very presence or absence of an article in the Greek. Yet observe what he does at Luke xxii. 10/Mark xiv. 13. For at Luke xxii. 10 he uses St. Mark's *απαντησει* with D *min*<sup>5</sup> (against *υπαντησει* CLX, and *συναντησει* NB *unc*<sup>15</sup> *rell*), while at Mark xiv. 13 he incorporates into the narrative *εισελθοντων υμων εις την πολιν* from Luke xxii. 10 with only *fam* 13 28 91-299 2<sup>pe</sup>.

Again, at Matt. xx. 13 he is to be observed very carelessly on both sides of the question. Once <sup>3.705</sup> with LZ 33 *sah boh syr sin aeth Nyss* writing *ουχι δηναριου συνεφωνησα σοι*, and again <sup>3.697</sup>, again <sup>thro' int 3.907</sup> *ουχι δηναριου συνεφωνησας μοι* with NB and all the rest, and *latt syr rell arm Auct<sup>or</sup> imp et de voc gent*. This place should be very carefully considered. Was the archetype of LZ 33 then on Origen's desk and annotated by him to conform to a turn of the versions?

We have another illustration of Origen's rank carelessness in St. Mark's Gospel. In one place, <sup>3.737</sup> concerning Mark xi. 1, he says precisely: "*και ο μαρκος δε κατα τον τοπον ουτως ανεγραψε· και οτε εγγιζουσιν εις ιεροσολυμα και εις βηθανιαν προς . . .*" and again <sup>3.743</sup> "*ιδωμεν δε περι της βηθφαγη μεν κατα ματθαιον, βηθανιας δε κατα μαρκον, βηθφαγη δε και βηθανιας κατα τον λουκαν.*"

Nothing could be plainer as to the Marcan reading of *εις Ιεροσολυμα και εις βηθανιαν* without *εις βηθφαγη*, and yet when in another place Origen comes to write out Mark xi. 1-12 he has there *εις ιεροσολυμα εις βηθφαγη και βηθανιαν*.

We note in these two places—these two codices as it were—of *Origen* that they vary in the spelling of *ευθυς* and *ευθεως* (xi. 3) and doubtless he was using different copies, without realizing it, when he penned the two passages. For instance in the one place (ver. 2) he leaves out *ουπω*, in the other it is present; again ver. 3 he leaves out in one place *παλιν*, in the other it is present.

Again ver. 3 one place *τι ποιειτε τουτο*; in the other *τι λυετε τον πωλον* with D.

Ver. 4	one place	<i>και απηλθον</i>	in the other	<i>και απελθοντες</i>
	„ „	<i>θυραν</i>	„ „	<i>την θυραν</i>
	„ „	<i>τον πωλον diserte</i>	„ two others	<i>πωλον.</i>

Further than that Origen does a thing at *Matt* xviii. 27 which throws a lurid light on the proceedings of the entire coterie, whose joint testimony we are asked to accept and whose mutual support is considered to bolster up the individual witness of a very small clan. This place both dates several witnesses and affords much help.

I refer to this substitution: For *και το δανειον αφηκεν αυτω*, *Origen* with 1 only and *ff<sub>1</sub> sah boh (ex xviii. 32)* says *πασαν την οφειλην*.

Origen's quotation, as given in Tischendorf, is ο δε σπλαγχνισθεις επ αυτω κυριος ουκ . . . αφηκεν αυτον μονον αλλα . . . πασαν την οφειλην αυτω. While this does not convict Origen absolutely of appropriating the wording of verse 32, and inserting it in verse 27, it comes so near to it that 1 and *sah boh* must have thought it a good idea to make the transfer. In other words they were following Origen, as Vulgate mss followed Jerome's other writings. (*Soden* adds his family φ<sup>n</sup>.)

The principal point is this (for **NB** do not agree to make the substitution): For many verses previously the testimony of Evan 1 (without 118-209) has been bolstering up B. I use this expression advisedly, for on the testimony in *Matt* xviii. 25 of B 1 56 58 124 *Orig* 1/2 Hort has inserted in his text *εχει* WITHOUT THE SLIGHTEST MARGINAL ALTERNATIVE. Evan 1 is contradicted by 118-209, 124 is contradicted by the rest of its family; 56 and 58 are of no account whatever [Dobbin is silent as to 61], for they are most notorious polyglot abusers of the truth, and Origen contradicts himself. They have been used here simply to bolster up B in his use of the historic present [see elsewhere under this head].

Again, upon the testimony of B 1 124 (again against their families) and *sah* 4/7 we are asked in *Matt* xviii. 27 to suppress *εκεινου* [by Hort in square brackets].

Now such mss do not really support B as a neutral text at all, for we find that 1 and *sah* and *Origen* are all in the same circle playing tricks on us; as at xviii. 27 in this very same verse where they ask us to read *πασαν την οφειλην* for *το δανειον*.

This dates the vagaries and other like ones observable in 1 *Orig* and *copt*, and makes us demur to use them as supporters of B as a neutral text. On the contrary B is supporting *them* for an Egyptian and private post-Origenian recension. I will illustrate further:—

*Matt.* xvii. 8. Hort prints *αυτον* *Ιησουν μονον*. This is read by B and by B only. **N** supports with *Ιησουν αυτον μονον*, both readings being obtained via the Coptic by **N** and B. Hort did not know this, for the Coptic or Syriac has never been alleged in the critical apparatus as containing this *αυτον*, nor does Horner connect the readings of **NB** with Coptic in his *sah* apparatus. But it seems perfectly clear to me where **NB** got the *αυτον*. Hort's margin has *τον* in place of *αυτον*. [*Sod*<sup>oso</sup> = B.]

14. *ελθοντων* (—*αυτων*) **NBZ** 1 124 245 *sah* is the only support. Hort's text gives no alternative, and we are to swallow the reading of this vicious little circle (whose joint eclecticism is now in process of demonstration) against *Origen* because it is a "shorter" text. Hort counts *seven* witnesses I suppose, but it is merely *one*.

xviii. 1. Hort's margin is dignified by the addition of *δε* here, to read *εν εκεινη δε τη ωρα* with BM *e sah*<sup>3/6</sup> *boh*<sup>omn</sup>. These are the

Matt.

only witnesses (+*καὶ syr cu*). *Boh*<sup>omn</sup> *e* is very suggestive, against the shorter text for *Gr*<sup>omn</sup> *Lat*<sup>omn</sup> *Syr*<sup>3/4</sup> *Orig*.

- xviii. 11. Another similar little coterie (observe the members are never homogeneous) ask us to omit this verse altogether. It is composed of *NBL*\* 1 (against family) 13 (against family) 33 892\* *e ff<sub>1</sub> sah boh<sup>ol</sup> syr sin hier* and *Orig*, and Hort promptly accepts their verdict with much gusto, referring in his margin to the Appendix, where three half-column lines are devoted to explain that it is "Interpolated either from Luke xix. 10 (a different context) or from an independent source written or oral." Where were *NL* above if right here? Why was *Orig* on the other side above? I mean merely that the whole editorial process is intuitive and has no scientific foundation whatever.

16. Hort's margin receives the order *παραλαβε ετι ενα η δυο μετα σου* of B *ff<sub>1</sub>* and *boh* (these only). Where is the science? B is evidently the controlling factor. But B got this from looking at† an Egyptian copy of the Scriptures with this order (*cf.* also *sah*).

To go back a little xvi. 21 *ἰϞ xϞ* stands in Hort's text without the alternative *ο ἰϞ*. I beg to say that only *N\*B\** read thus (both corrected) and that their only support is *sah*<sup>2/3</sup> *boh*<sup>omn</sup> *praeter duo*. Whereas *N<sup>ca</sup>* 892 *Orig* and *Iren* omit altogether.

If right here then in the name of all that is consistent why does Hort reject the +*τοτε* in xiv. 3 of B and *fam* 13 with *sah* most decidedly: "*εν τωτω τω καιρω*"? Even *k* suggests it with "*cum detinuisset*" against "*Herodes enim tenuit*" but Hort prints *κρατησας*.‡ For at viii. 18 Hort does not scruple to accept B and *sah* alone for his text of *οχλον* against *οχλους etc.* And at ii. 21 he reads *εισηλθεν* (for *ηλθεν*) *NBC* alone, merely confirmed by *sah boh* *αφδωκ εβραϊ, αψι εδουρτ*.

Now these conjunctions *NB* and *NBC* and *NBD* have been given too much weight when insufficiently supported otherwise.

Observe xii. 17 *να* (*pro οπως*) *NBCD* 1 33 *Orig Eus boh*. If I oppose this I shall be told that I am a madman, and that this evidence is absolutely conclusive. I deny it. And I point to viii. 34 where *να* (*pro οπως*) is read by B alone and *boh*. [*Soden* adds nothing.]

Hort does not follow B here in viii. 34, but why not? If *να* is neutral in xii. 17, why not in viii. 34? Bohairic uses it in both places. Did Hort have a glimmer that B after all was copied from a Graeco-Coptic ms and that *βινα* caught B's eye instead of *οπως*? If so, where is the neutral text?

The same remark applies to *εως* and *εως ου*. In Matt. xviii. 30

† As *N* in Matt. xiv. 1 *etc.* *τετρααρχης* more *copt*. ‡ *Soden*'s text accepts +*τοτε* with <sup>060</sup>.



NBCL write *εως αποδω* for *εως οὖ αποδω* of the rest; but in xviii. 34, only four verses beyond, B *alone* writes *εως αποδω*. (See full list in Luke.) Possibly *ου* is dropped for fear of confusion with *οὖ*.

After a thorough re-examination of the subject I re-affirm my belief that however good a base the MS B may have in places, it is absolutely to be disregarded as representing any such thing as a "neutral" text; that in many places it is as far removed from "neutrality" as night from day; that "neutrality" can alone be sought among the documents which are in agreement with the witnesses of pre-Origenian date.

To rank B "neutral" as a whole is to discredit testimony of Clement of Alexandria when supported by a host of witnesses; to discredit Tertullian and Epiphanius jointly when they reproduce faithfully the text of Marcion [as regards language, not as regards brevity], equally supported by a large array of authorities; to discredit much of the "western" text even when it is undoubtedly the "shortest," in the face of two differing lines of addition, with or without conflation of these two lines; to discredit Origen himself when he opposes B but has good support otherwise; to discredit the old Syriac when opposing B in favour of *Σ* or of D; and finally to shut the door on a possible neutral text reproduced in no Gk. mss extant but witnessed to strongly by pre-Origenian Fathers, backed by Latin, Syriac, or Coptic mss. (*Cf* Adalbert Merx, II. Theil, I. Hälfte p. 20, *etc.*)

I re-affirm my belief that a polyglot text influenced *Σ* throughout.† And I charge B with being the child of a Graeco-Latin recension, and by its scribe or by its parent of being tremendously influenced by a Coptic recension or by a Graeco-sahidic <sup>and</sup>/<sub>or</sub> a Graeco-bohairic ms.‡

I cannot allow that *ΣB* influenced the sahidic or bohairic versions (except perhaps a few separate mss of each or either of them); for the sympathy visible between *Σ* or B or both and the Coptic versions is a sympathetic bond which antedates the mss *Σ* and B, and which contributes to place these versions (where they oppose *ΣB*) on an independent footing implying a Greek text of older date than that of *ΣB*, and when supported by other good witnesses to be followed.

And I charge Westcott and Hort with having utterly failed to produce any semblance of a "neutral" text. I charge them with the offence of repeated *additions* to the narrative on most insufficient evidence.

I charge the Oxford edition of 1910 with continual errors in accepting Westcott and Hort's text for many verses together where the absence

† In the list of differences between *Σ* and B in Part II will be found plenty of material to support this proposition.

‡ Proof to this effect may be seen throughout the following pages.

of footnotes shows that the editors consider their text as settled. I acknowledge and make confession freely that the Revisers have retraced steps in a number of places and ejected Hort's readings sometimes even without the pro and con in a footnote, where Hort blindly followed a phantasma of evidence. But this text is still founded on too high a regard for B, and I pray for an entire reconsideration of the matter in the light of what follows.

One word here as to the "Western" text may not be out of place. Upon many occasions this "Western" text is the one which furnishes the *shortest* text (against B). We have been taught that the "Western" text is the one which has the most *additions* and accretions. *This feature is quite distinct from the other*, and whether the additions be all glosses or not, the other feature of omission has to be separately considered as to its bearing on the basic or fundamental text for purity or shortness, for the text of D is, as we know from Clement of Alex., one which was in Egypt very early, at a date before the "African" Latin was known, is confirmed often by W, and has come down to us less influenced by side influences than the other recensions.

Take one instance. At Luke xix. 2 there are great varieties of reading, where D *d e* and *sah* preserve the shortest text, giving us (as to Zaccheus) simply *πλουσιος* for *και πλουσιος* of *l s*, *και ην πλουσιος* of *NL* 245 892 *goth syr hier* (and *W-H marg*), *και πλουσιος ην boh syr cu sin*, *και αυτος πλουσιος BKP* *big vg* (*W-H txt*), *και αυτος ην πλουσιος U al. latt*, *και ουτος ην πλουσιος A unc<sup>12</sup> al. f*, *ουτος ην πλουσιος W* 108 157, *πλουσιος ην ante και αρχιτελωνης syr pesh*, *πλουσιος (tantum) ante και αρχιτελωνης diatess arab*, (*Ψ and Evst* 47 omit altogether). *W-H* adopt B's reading in *text* and *N's* in *marg*, and neglect D *d e sah* (*diatess*) altogether. Then why at Luke xxiv. 12, 36, 40, 51, 52 double-bracket the "Western non-interpolations"? Where is the science involved of the "shorter" text? Dr. Salmon ('Some Thoughts,' *etc.* p. 98) says "I am persuaded that critics will be forced to acknowledge that the Gospel as read in the 11<sup>th</sup> century in the Church of Rome differed in a few particulars from that read at the same date at Alexandria. Critics may discuss which of these texts is authoritative, or whether both may be so; but I am sure that an arbitrarily created hybrid between the two is wrong; and this is the kind of text more than once exhibited by *W-H* in the closing verses of St. Luke."

The claim of *W-H* to have resurrected the texts of Origen certainly holds good except in certain places. But in doing so they far exceed Origen's own claim. Origen's citations are full of conflation, where he knew *two* recensions and incorporated both. If he was not able to judge which of these was original, why should he be a perfect judge of other double readings similarly situated but of which he chose one? Now *W-H* profess that they have not only restored the text of Origen but that they know that this is "pre-Syrian" and "pre-Alexandrian" and, as

represented by B, is "neutral" and fundamentally correct as opposed to all others.† Their "selected readings," few and far between, can certainly not be considered proof of their contention, and we are prepared to challenge their assumption as to the supremacy of B. Meanwhile we would like to place on record again what Canon Cook had to say about the personality of Origen in connection with these matters, for that feature is of vital importance. The Church at large disagreed with Origen's conclusions. *W-H* after nearly 1700 years merely wish to replace us textually in the heart of an Alexandrian text, which after A.D. 450 or thereabouts fell into discredit and disuse. For Dr. Salmon says ('Some Thoughts,' *etc.* pp. 106/7): "Giving to the common parent of B and ~~Σ~~ as high antiquity as is claimed for it, still it will be distant by more than a century from the original autographs, and the attempts to recover the text of MSS which came to Alexandria in the second century *may be but an elaborate locking of the stable door after the horse has been stolen.*"

Again the same authority (pp. 128/9): "When *W-H* refuse to give a local name to the readings they prefer, and designate them as neutral, that is to say, as free from corruptions of various kinds, they are disguising from themselves and from their readers that the question what text has the most early attestation cannot be decisively answered."

And again (pp. 131/132): "Thus the task of discrimination may be difficult; but we must not conceive that we have solved a problem because for our convenience we have simplified it. The problem has not been completely solved until we have taken account of the evidence *which has been temporarily neglected.*"

And again (p. 157): "I hold, on the contrary, that in critical science the rule *nullum tempus* prevails; that it is never too late to reverse a wrong decision."

And now to hear what Canon Cook has to say about Origen:—

"We go back one step further, a most critical and important step, for it brings us at once into contact with the greatest name, the highest genius, the most influential person of all Christian antiquity. We come to *Origen*. And it is not disputed that Origen bestowed special pains upon every department of Biblical criticism and exegesis. His 'Hexapla' is a monument of stupendous industry and keen discernment: but his labours on the Old Testament were thwarted by his very imperfect knowledge of Hebrew, and by the tendency to mystic interpretations common in his own age, but in no other writer so fully developed or pushed to the same extremes.

"In his criticism of the New Testament Origen had greater

---

† However *Origen* and B are not infrequently in conflict. Observe Hort on those occasions. See beyond at the end of my notes on each Gospel.

advantages, and he used them with greater success. Every available source of information he studied carefully. Manuscripts and versions were before him; both manuscripts and versions he examined, and brought out the results of his researches with unrivalled power. But no one who considers the peculiar character of his genius, his subtlety, his restless curiosity, his audacity in speculation, *his love of innovation*, will be disposed to deny the extreme risk of adopting any conclusion, any reading, which rests on his authority, unless it is supported by the independent testimony of earlier or contemporary Fathers and Versions. The points in which we are specially entitled to look for innovations are: (1) curious and ingenious readings, such, for instance, as those which we have noticed in St. Mark and St. Luke; (2) the removal of words, clauses, or entire sentences which a man of fastidious taste might regard as superfluities or repetitions" [see my remarks on "pairs" and Origenistic "niceties"]; "(3) a fearless and highly speculative mode of dealing with portions of the New Testament which might contain statements opposed to his prepossessions or present difficulties which even his ingenuity might be unable to solve. In weighing the evidence of his citations for or against any doubtful reading, while we should feel assured of his perfect honesty of purpose, we ought to be extremely cautious in adopting his conclusions. A text formed more or less directly under his influence would of course command a certain amount of general adhesion; it would approve itself most especially to minds *similarly gifted and similarly developed*; when brought to bear upon the course of critical enquiry it would produce an enormous effect, especially if it came with the charm and interest of novelty; but not less certainly would it be challenged, and its verdict be refused, if it contravened principles of fundamental importance and affected the veracity of the sacred writers and the teaching of Holy Writ." (Canon Cook, 'Revised Version of the first three Gospels,' pp. 155/6.)

Hear also Bishop Marsh on the same subject ('Lect.' xi. ed. 1838, p. 482): "Whenever therefore grammatical interpretation produced a sense which in Origen's opinion was irrational or impossible, in other words irrational or impossible according to the philosophy which Origen had learnt (*sic*) at Alexandria, he then *departed* from the literal sense."

This sums up many other matters connected with Origen's treatment of textual matters (to which the following pages bear witness), so that we do not necessarily recover Origen's *manuscripts* when we are inclined to follow *NB Orig*, but very likely only Origen himself. (The MS 33 seems to represent a copy annotated by Origen himself with suggested "improvements." They are sometimes together quite alone. The same applies to the MS 127, and observe that 127 is related to a *graeco-latin*: Matt. xxii. 9 *προς* (*pro eis*) 127 *sol* = *latt* AD *exitus viarum*.)

To begin at the very beginning, when Hort says:

"But we have not been able to recognise as Alexandrian any

readings of B in any book of the New Testament which it contains" (vol. ii. p. 150)

had he never noticed the frequent preference given by B (and **N**) to *εαυτου* and *εαυτων* over *αυτου* and *αυτων*? In order to keep small detail out of my apparatus I began stupidly enough by not chronicling these things in **N** and B, but some examples will be found. Now turn to Clement of Alexandria and see his preference for the same course: (on Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45) *και δουναι την ψυχην την εαυτου*.

Then turn to *Athanasius*:

1 Pet. iv. 19 (where B alone omits *αυτων* after *ψυχας*) *Ath* says *τας εαυτων ψυχας* in the coptic manner.

Observe further:

(1) Jo. x. 31. "*εβαστασαν* sine copula cum **NBL** 33" says Tischendorf. Follow the apparatus a little further and you find **ATHANASIUS**, Surely then this is an Alexandrian reading. Observe further that after two words more **ATHANASIUS** drops *οι ιουδαιοι* with the new Egyptian MS W, and the Alexandrian picture is complete there.

( ) Jo. xvii. 15 referred to by Burgon as to an omission by B and *Ath* is questionable.

(2) Matt. xii. 31. *αφεθησεται υμιν τοις ανθρωποις* B 1 *sah* and **ATHANASIUS** only.

(3) Matt. xxvi. 45. *ιδου + γαρ* BE and *sah* **ATH**<sup>bis</sup>.

(4) Luke xi. 19. *αυτοι υμων κριται εσονται* BD 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> only of Greeks, *a<sub>2</sub> c d t* of Latins, with **ATHANASIUS**, choosing this order out of five or six differing orders by the other authorities.

(5) †Jo. i. 13. — *ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος* B\* 17\* *Eus Clem*<sup>dis vid</sup> and **ATHAN**<sup>dis vid</sup> Ps. xxi.

(6) Jo. v. 37. *εκεινος* (*pro αυτος*) **NBLW a** (*goth*) and **ATHANASIUS** (*D d εκεινος αυτος*). *Om αυτος* 892 = *syr cu pers georg*.

This *εκεινος* is so thoroughly Johannine in such a connection that it is difficult to judge whether it may be basic or only an endeavour by **NBLW Ath** to improve the passage to a conformity with Johannine diction. But the action of D is suspicious. See as to *εκεινος* beyond under "Syriac" heading in St. John's Gospel at iv. 11.

(7) Jo. vi. 42. *πως νυν* (*pro πως ουν*) BCTW *boh*<sup>pl</sup> *goth syr hier* only and **ATHANASIUS**<sup>codd</sup> (*teste Tisch*). Add *Sod*<sup>050</sup>.

(8) Jo. x. 32 *fin*. Order > *εμε λιθαζετε* of **NBLW** 33 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>050</sup> only of Greeks, but of *it*<sup>pl</sup> *vg*, is the order of **ATH**, against DW and the rest and *c d f l δ sah boh syr goth Epiph Hil*

---

† And this matter has some bearing upon our contention as to "pairs" of expressions.

Paris<sup>97</sup> is not extant for control in St. Matthew in Schmidtke's edition, and Ψ only begins at Mark ix. 6, but 892 is valuable in Matthew.

I do not overlook the fact that the side opposed to NB sometimes also tried its hand at improvement. See *Matt.* xv. 6 *την εντολην* (*ex Marco vii. 8*) for *τον λογον* of BD and versions, but even here N is not agreed with B and writes *τον νομον* with CT<sup>c</sup> *fam* 13 and *Ptol.* The support of *Ptol* puts *τον νομον* into the second century, and is not far removed from *την εντολην*.

Burkitt says :

“The Antiochian Greek text seems never to have influenced Egypt—at least not before the x<sup>th</sup> century. Freedom from specifically ‘Antiochian’ readings is a characteristic of all forms of the Egyptian N.T.”—Burkitt in ‘Texts and Versions,’ *Encyc. Bibl.* 1903.

But precisely because long ago Egypt had *revised* this Antiochian text.

This revising process will now engage our attention for many pages.

*Thdt.* When NBL oppose *sah boh* and have *Athanasius* with them we may surely take it into account.

- (9) Jo. xii. 28. *δοξασον μου το ονομα* (*pro δοξ. σου το ονομα*) B<sup>sol</sup> *cum Evan* 5. But so L X and ATHANASIUS *δοξασον σου τον υιον* (*Cyr* refers to both).
- (10) Jo. xv. 21. *αλλα ταυτα παντα ποιησουσιν εις υμας* BD\*LN<sup>2</sup> 1 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Petr*<sup>alex</sup>, all others *υμας* or *υμιν*.
- (11) Jo. xix. 31. *η ημερα εκεινη του σαββατου* (*pro η ημερα εκεινου του σαββατου* B\*H *min pauc Elz*<sup>ed</sup> *pers c f g vgg* and *Cyrl*<sup>alex</sup>, all others *εκεινου*).
- (12) 1 Peter i. 11. Of the prophets of old: *ερευωντες εις τινα η ποιον καιρον εδηλουτο εν αυτοις πνευμα* (— *Χριστου*) *προμαρτυρομενον τα εις Χριστον παθηματα*. . . . B<sup>sol</sup>

*Von Soden* now adds the testimony of ATHANASIUS to that of B for omission of *Χριστου*. In the Benedictine edition of 1698 of *Ath.* the word is not omitted, but if *Ath*<sup>cod</sup>, presumably examined by *Soden*, really omit, we are thoroughly justified in connecting this strange omission with Alexandria.

But in another place Hort writes as follows:

“The perpetuation of the purer text may in great measure be laid to the credit of the watchful scholars of Alexandria; its best representatives among the versions are the Egyptian, and especially that of Lower Egypt; and the quotations which follow it are most abundant in *Clement*, *Origen* (*Dionysius*, *Peter*), *Didymus* and the younger *Cyrl*, ALL ALEXANDRIANS.” Hort, vol. i. p. 549.

As to whether the Alexandrian School *preserved* the true text, or modified it by attempted improvement, is what we are to inquire into.

Hort's system involves dragging in readings of B whenever support can be found from another MS. Since Hort's day his true system thus demands and compels the acceptance of further “monstra” exhibited by B owing to support forthcoming since from other MSS or versions (such as 604 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *syrr sin*). I make free to prophecy that other documents so far unknown will add to this list a further crop of vicious survivals which might give us eventually all of B's misreadings. The system is thus demonstrated to be unscientific in the extreme, notwithstanding the praise so fulsomely lavished on it by a certain school.

I propose to sketch the matter in St. Matthew. In St. Luke I will go into the matter a little more thoroughly in some respects. And in St. Mark I will add a section on the differing recensions visible in that Gospel. The treatise might run to undue length if all four Gospels were handled quite exhaustively. In St. John I have been obliged to go into great detail owing to the character of the Gospel and its pleonastic expressions leading to textual difficulties.

## CHAPTER II.

### B IN ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

#### *Example of editing by B.*

Matt. v. 37. "Let your word be yea yea, nay nay." For *εστω* B alone with  $\Sigma$  *min*<sup>4</sup> *Eus* substitutes *εσται*. Hort actually dignifies this with a place in his margin. Now if B be right,  $\aleph$  and every other MS and Father are wrong and the copies in their hands most curiously mutilated.

For Justin Martyr, Clement and Clem<sup>hom</sup> several times, Tertullian, Cyprian and Iren. all witness to *εστω*, while John Damascene confirms it absolutely, for quoting the same saying from *St. James* v. 12, where the rare form *ητω* obtains (and is constant in all MSS), he quotes it as *εστω*.

(Clem<sup>alex</sup> as a matter of fact seems to be on both sides and both in *Strom*. This is not indicated by *Tisch*.)

#### *Examples of Solecisms or practical Solecisms of B.*

- v. 11. *ενεκα* B<sup>sol</sup>
- vi. 18. > *νηστευειν τοις ανθρωποις* B (*k*) only
- 21. *- και* B and one *boh* codex
- 33. > *την δικαιοσυνην και την βασιλειαν αυτου* B<sup>sol</sup>
- ibid.* *χρητε (pro χρηζετε)* B\* <sup>sol</sup>
- xii. 20. No one seems to have emphasised *ληνον* by B (for *λινον*, flax). I do not think this is an itacism because *k* and *vg*<sup>c</sup> check us. *ληνος* or *λανος* means *wool* ("smoking wool"), but also in a sense *wood* (wooden winepress, trough, coffin, etc.), hence probably the *lignum* of *k*, which the very old Vulgate text of *vg*<sup>c</sup> confirms. B and *k* draw together elsewhere, but I have not seen notice taken of it here. *Lignum* is not necessarily therefore an error for *Linum*. Indeed in an ancient Graeco-latin B may have seen *lignum*, since *k* has preserved it.  
*Sah boh* imply a wick of flax, but *aeth* suggests the woody fibre of flax.
- 32. *ουκ αφεθησεται (pro αφεθησεται primo loco)* B<sup>sol</sup>



Matt.

*ibid.* ου μη αφεθη (pro ουκ αφεθησεται *sec loco*) B38. — και φαρισαιων B *min*<sup>2</sup>? against all others48 *fin.* — μου (post οι αδελφοι) B<sup>sol</sup> *vid cum Ev Ebion*<sup>Epiph</sup>xiii. 4. και ελθοντα τα πετεινα κατεφαγεν B *fam* 13 only *vid* (and not from a parallel) but *cf. von Soden*5. της γης (pro γης) B<sup>sol</sup> (*De novo* B<sup>sol</sup> της γης *Marc iv. 5*)6. εκαυματωθη B (*rell et* ~~Ν~~ εκαυματισθη *et D* εκαυματισθησαν)17. — και δικαιοι B<sup>sol</sup>24. ελαλησεν (pro παρεθηκεν) B\* *vid et k* [*Negl. Soden*]xiv. 2. — δια τουτο B<sup>sol</sup> [*Habet Marc vi. 14*]5. επει (pro οτι) B\*<sup>sol</sup> *cum* 604; επειδη ΣΝ (*sah* expresses this curiously) *Cf. xxi. 46* which B was considering.19. κελευσατε (pro κελευσας) B\* *Sod*<sup>1443</sup>36. παρεκαλουν (— αυτον) B 892 *Orig* 1/2 *Chr*xv. 11. ερχομενον (pro εισερχομενον) B<sup>sol</sup>15. αυτω ειπεν (pro ειπεν αυτω) B<sup>sol</sup> *pers*17. εισερχομενον (pro εισπορευομενον) B *Orig* 1/2. Add *Sod*<sup>050</sup>32. — ηδη B 106 301 *l vg*<sup>L</sup> (*cf syr copt aeth*)xvi. 4. αιτει (pro ζητει) B<sup>sol</sup> (*cum pers*<sup>int</sup> *arab*<sup>int</sup>; *cf. syr ancipitem curam linguae*)14. οι δε (pro αλλοι δε) B<sup>sol</sup> *et Eus* (*Chr*)17. — οτι B<sup>sol</sup>. Add *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *teste Sod, sed contra ed.*21. δεικνυναι (pro δεικνυειν) B<sup>sol</sup> *cum Orig*<sup>semel</sup>22. λεγει αυτω επιτιμων B<sup>sol</sup> (pro ηρξατο επιτιμαν αυτω λεγων) and *W-H marg*xvii. 25. απο τινος (pro απο τινων) B 238 *sol. Cyr* 2/4. Add *Sod*<sup>aliqua</sup>xviii. 9. σκανδαλει (pro σκανδαλιζει) B<sup>sol</sup>. Correctors have not changed. It is accented σκανδαλει.28. — εκεινος B 245 *pers sol* (*arm*<sup>zoh</sup> *contra codd*)30. > αυτου οι συνδουλοι B<sup>sol</sup> *et copt*xix. 22. χρηματα (pro κτηματα) B<sup>sol</sup> (*Chr*) Is this "simple" and "inartificial"? Hort says "no," for he rejects it from his text and margin.*Cf* Liddell and Scott *sub* χρημα: "The interchange of χρημα and κτημα is frequent, yet the same distinction holds as between χραιομαι and κταομαι, so that κτημα is strictly a possession, χρημα what one wants or uses."In other words "money" to B or the scribe of B was more familiar (χρήματ' ἀνὴρ "money makes the man," *Pindar*) than landed possessions. B<sup>scribe</sup> was a city man, a town man, as is seen all through his attitude.

St. Mark differentiates between κτηματα and χρηματα in x. 22/23 of the parallel.†

† See further remarks as to this in section on Patristic quotations and Clement of Alexandria.

St. Luke (= Mark x. 23) uses *χρηματα*, having in the previous verse said merely *ην γαρ πλουσιος σφοδρα*. In Mark x. 22 it is D which substitutes *χρηματα* for *κτηματα*.

In this connection consider next (out of the regular order) :

Matt.

xxv. 27. *τα αργυρια μου* (for *το αργυριον μου*) **N<sup>\*</sup>BW** 604 only; "my monies" for "my money" although referring only to the *one talent* as *Tisch* points out. All the other Greeks, sympathising cursives, Latins, *boh* and *sah* have the singular. One solitary *sah* ms No. 8, by the change of π to ϖ, gives the plural with **NB**. I think these two places looked at together are very instructive.†

xx. 18. — *εις θανατον vel θανατω* **B aeth**

25. *κατακυριευσουσιν*. **B** 124 *al. perpauc* (contra *rell et verss*)

27. *ειναι υμων πρωτος* **B** alone among many variations, apparently the nearest to *copt*.

xxi. 19. *ου μηκετι* (for *μηκετι*) **BL<sup>7</sup>** only, being a strengthened negative but against all the rest and *Orig<sup>bis</sup> Meth* and even *Peter* of Alexandria.

31. After varying the order of vv. 29/30 **B** with only a very few cursives and *sah boh* etc., remains alone at verse 31 with *ο υστερος*, for *Evan* 4 has *ο δευτερος*, and **D** with the other few *ο εσχατος*. Hort places *ο υστερος* in his text.

xxii. 39.† *ομοιως* (*pro* *ομοια*) **B<sup>sol</sup> vid** } The one change hangs on  
*ibid.* — *αυτη* **B<sup>sol</sup> vid** } the other.

xxiii. 27. *ομοιαζετε* (*pro* *παρομοιαζετε*) **B** 1 [*non fam*]

37. — *εαυτης* **B** 604 *sol* (*libere Clem* 1/3 *Orig* 2/6 *Eus* 4/5)

xxiv. 1. *εκ* (*pro* *απο*) **B** 4 *Soden*<sup>96 1353 1443</sup> (*syr*) Cf *Marc* xiii. 1

23. *πιστευετε* **B** 262 *Orig<sup>odd</sup>* (cf *Marc* xiii. 21)

38. *γαμисκοντες* **B** et *Sod<sup>duo</sup>*

xxv. 6. *εγενετο* (*pro* *γεγονεν*) **B** (cf xxiv. 21 *εγενετο* **BD** 604)

23. *πιστος ης* (*pro* *ης πιστος*) **B** *h r* (*Iren<sup>int</sup>*) *syr*

40. — *των αδελφων μου* **B<sup>2</sup> ff.** 2 *vg<sup>T</sup> arm?* *Clem* 4/5 *lib Ath*

42. — *ουκ pr.* (*ante* *εδωκατε*) **B<sup>\*</sup>** et *vg<sup>w</sup> soli*

42. + *και* (*ante* *εδιψησα*) **BL aeth syr pesh diatess** (contra *rell omn et copt*)

xxvi. 4. — *και αποκτεινουσιν* **B** *min<sup>4</sup> r<sub>2</sub> vg<sup>L</sup>* [*non al.*]

42. — *λεγων* **B** *g<sub>1</sub> soli vid*

51. *μετ αυτου* (*pro* *μετα ιησου*) **B<sup>sol</sup> vid** *cum Hil*

53. *δυναμαι* **B**

61. *οικοδομησαι* (— *αυτου*) **B** 1–209 [*non* 118] 69 [*non fam*]

*Orig* 2/4. *Sod<sup>750</sup> al.* (Origen gives three readings here.)

† Cf *Hawkins*' 'Horæ Syn.' p. 4. Plural never used in the LXX, where the singular occurs over 350 times. *Soden* adds <sup>960</sup> for the plural.

‡ *Male Horner* *ομοια*.

Matt.

- xxvii. 6. κορβαν B\* (*f g<sub>1</sub> q r<sub>2</sub> aur gat vg<sup>6</sup>, corbam a d h r*) *aeth*  
 13. οσα (*pro ποσα*) B<sup>sol</sup> (D τοσα)  
 17. τον βαραββαν B 1 Sod<sup>1132</sup> *Orig soli vid [non copt]*  
 (21. τον βαραββαν NBL 1 33 122 892 (*sah boh χε δαρραδαε*  
*cf syr*) If improvised in *ver* 17, probably also here)  
 24. κατεναντι (*pro απεναντι*) BD *soli vid et W-H [non al. Sod]*  
 29. περιεθηκαν B 131? for εθηκαν of KNWΔΠ *syr boh latt longe*  
*plur* and επεθηκαν N *unc<sup>pl</sup> min<sup>pl</sup> d h vg<sup>q</sup> Eus (sah)*  
 This is a clear improvisation by B, and would equate such a thing  
 as περιελευχον of 157 at Luke xvi. 21, except that it comes from  
 Mark xv. 17 “και περιτιθεασιν αυτω πλεξαντες ακανθ. στεφ.”  
 33. εις τον τοπον του B<sup>sol</sup> (*pro εις τοπον*) *cf. sah boh et Luc xxiii. 33.*  
 See under “Harmonies.”  
 43. επι τω θεω (*pro επι τον θεον*) B 213 *soli latt<sup>pl</sup> Eus 1/2 Juven.*  
*W-H<sup>mg</sup>*

This seems to be a delicate choice of the dative after πεποιθεν. The acc. or dative can accompany πειθω according to its various shades of meaning. Here apparently “He was fully persuaded of and conformed to God.”

### B and Latin Sympathy.

It is quite impossible to divorce B from Latin affiliations. In the detail of this matter will be found much food for reflection in this Gospel and in the others.

These lists are compiled to assist in differentiating between a possible common base of the Greek and Latin witnesses and a real appropriation by B of Latinisms or Latin readings. The full force of the matter is felt when we see where W goes with B and where it does not.

Matt.

- i. 22. κυριου (— του) NBCDWZA (observe both D and Δ are present)  
 25. εως ετεκεν (*pro εως ου ετεκεν*) B<sup>sol</sup> [W-H] (*cf Luc xii. 59*)  
 ii. 13. εφανη (*pro φαινεται*) B 372 and *latt*  
 vi. 10. και επι γης (— της) NBWZA *Clem Orig<sup>sexies</sup>*  
 18. > υηστεων τοις ανθρωποις B (*k*) *soli*  
 ix. 28. > τουτο δυναμαι ποιησαι B *l q vg<sup>w</sup>*  
 x. 4. καναναιος (*pro κανανιτης*) BCD (*χαν.*) L *min pauc copt it vg et δ*  
 16. εις το μεσον (*pro εν τω μεσω*) *λυκων* B<sup>sol</sup> *cum ff<sub>1</sub> k vg<sup>B</sup> Lucif.*  
 23. ισραηλ (— του) BD [W-H] *latt (cf Marc xv. 32)*  
 xii. 1, 12. σαββατοις (*pro σαββασιν*) B<sup>sol</sup> *et vett sabbatis*  
 xii. 4. δ (*pro ους*) BDW 13 22 124 *b d k q aur vg<sup>z</sup> syr*  
 xiii. 5. εξανειτλαν (*pro εξανειτειλεν*) B<sup>sol</sup> *Cf latt exorta sunt.* See  
 “Change of Number.”  
 8. επεσεν εις B\* (*pro επεσεν επι*) *sed B ipse vid επι substituit*  
 39. αιωνος (— του) NBD *fam 13 33 Orig 1/2 latt (contra sah et boh*  
*diserte τουτου του αιωνος)*

Matt.

- xiii. 40. The above is followed suspiciously closely by *κατακαίεται* NB (D - *οντα*) 1 [*non* 118-209] *Cyr* and *latt* "comburentur," "exuruntur" (*contra rell Gr*). The Coptic word, one chosen out of many, *σεροκζοϣ* (hence "sirocco") may also intimate *κατακαίεται* rather than *καίεται*. W with the rest *καίεται*.
- [xiii. 46. A very curious case occurs here, where NB and all agree in *πεπρακεν* against the aorist of D alone *επωλησεν*]
- xiv. 9. *λυπηθεις* (*pro ελυπηθη*) BD 1 *fam* 13 604. Some Latins *contristatus* without *est* (against the other Greeks and the important witnesses *c f k q\* copt arm syr*). This *λυπηθεις* looks strangely like the Latin *contristatus* (-*est*), for the copula *δε* wanting in BD is found in the Latins *c f k q\* (copt syr)*, which have *contristatus est*, showing that *est* did not slip in there by mistake.
10. *ιωαννην* (-*τον*) only B<sup>N</sup>\*Z<sup>Θ</sup> 1 as *lat*. Otherwise *sah boh* "he took off the head of John."
29. *πετρος* (-*ο*) NBD [*non minn*] W-H
32. *αναβαντων* (*pro εμβαντων*) NBDT<sup>c</sup> 892 (*latt*: *ascendentibus*)
- xv. 31. *κωφους ακουοντας* (*pro κωφ. λαλουντας*) B<sup>Φ</sup> 59 115 238 and *e* "surdos audientes" (while *d* using *surdos* yet has *loquentes*, as also *k*). All the rest and *latt* have *λαλουντας*. I class this here because of the acceptance by *d e k* of *surdos* for *mutos*. *κωφος* is used in N.T. both for *dumb* and *deaf* (*vide* our Eng. transl.). *Boh* turns the difficulty by beginning *mutos loquentes*, continuing *et clodos ambulantes et caecos videntes*, and closing with the addition of *surdos audientes*, while *a* cuts out nearly the whole verse.
37. > *το περισσεουν των κλ. ηραν*. Latin order, supported only by BD 1 33 892 against the Greeks and other versions.
- xvii. 3. *ωφθη* (*pro ωφθησαν*) [*μωυσης και ηλειας* following] corresponds to *latt mult* "paruit."
- The polyglot character of NB is shown in this same verse where they change the order *μετ αυτου συλλαλουντες* (*cum eo loquentes*) to *συλλαλ. μετ αυτου* with W 1 *ff*<sub>1.2</sub> *q sah boh aeth* and *syr* *Cyr*. So again xvii. 7 *προσηλθεν ο ιησους και αφαμενος* NB *fam* 13 604 *it*<sup>pl</sup> *vg syr* against *προσελθων ... ηφατο* of the rest.
22. *συστρεφομενων δε αυτων* (*pro αναστρεφ. δε αυτων*) NB 1 892. Cf *lat*<sup>pl</sup> *conversantibus*; *et re . . . c e ff*<sub>1</sub>; *et Orig* ("neutral") *στρεφομενων δε αυτων*.
- xix. 3. *φαρισαιοι* (-*οι*) BCLMWΔΠΣ *al. pauc boh Dam*.
16. *σχω* (*pro εχω*) BD *Sod*<sup>381</sup> *latt Orig* 1/2 (*contra* NL *κληρονομισω*)
21. *λεγει* (*pro εφη*) B *Sod*<sup>650</sup> *fam* 13 only of Greeks with all Latins.
24. -*οτι* B *plur* and *latt* (*but* against NCLMZ *copt syr*)

Matt.

- xx. 20. *απ αυτου* (*pro παρ αυτου*) BD 604 *W-H*. Cf *latt sah*  
 33. > *οι οφθαλμοι ημων* NBDLZ 33 892 *Sod*<sup>371 al 4</sup> *latt*  
 xxi. 28. > *δυο τεκνα* B<sup>1</sup> 142 299 *Sod*<sup>al 5</sup> *latt<sup>omn</sup>*  
 xxii. 4. *ητοιμακα* NBC\*DL 1 22 33 604 892\*; against *ητοιμασα* of the  
 rest, strengthened by *Orig Cyr Chr Dam*. Hort uses *ητοιμακα*  
 here without a sign in the margin. This is not Origen.  
 5. *επι την εμποριαν* (*pro εις την εμπ.*) NBCDThΣΦ *fam* 13 33  
 125\* 157 [*non* 28] 604 *Orig* and *LATT*.  
 30. - του θεου BD *fam* 1 [*non fam* 13] 604 *a b c d e f ff<sub>2</sub> h q r*  
*vg<sup>EZ</sup> syr cu sin sah arm Orig<sup>ter</sup> W-H*, but cf *Marc xii. 25*  
 Note that *W* has *του θεου* with the rest and does not go  
 with *D* here.  
 xxiv. 3. - της (*ante συντελειας*) NBCL<sup>7</sup> *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *fam* 1 33 157 892 *Cyr<sup>hier</sup>*  
 38. + *εκειναις* BD *Sod*<sup>duo</sup> *latt* and *sah*  
 xxv. 16. *εκερδησεν* (*pro εποιησεν*), and - *ταλαντα* *fin* by BCDL, and  
 BL respectively, shows very strong Latin affiliation, both  
 being against *N* and the mass.  
 29. *του δε μη εχοντος* (*pro απο δε του μη εχοντος*) NBDL 1-209  
 [*non* 118] 33 124 [*non fam*] = *Lat*.  
 41. *κατηραμενοι* (- *οι*) NBLT<sup>r</sup> 33 *Sod*<sup>1246</sup> *boh Cyr* 1/2 (*contra*  
*rell et Patr Gr permultos*) et *Orig<sup>bis</sup>*.  
 xxvi. 45. *καθευδετε λοιπον* (*pro καθ. το λοιπον*) BCLW 273 348 *m<sup>scr</sup>*  
*p<sup>scr</sup>* 892 *Sod*<sup>al</sup>. seems to equate *ηδη* and the Latin *jam* [see  
*Liddell and Scott*]. *Syr* with *sah* and *aeth* = "ergo."  
 53. *πλειω* (*pro πλειους*) N\*BD *W-H* [*non minn*] *latt* (against *Origen*)  
 xxvii. 43. *επι τω θεω* (*pro επι τον θεον*) B 213 *sol* *latt<sup>pl</sup>* et *W-H mg*.  
 49. *ειπαν* B *fam* 13 (and *ειπον* D 69) *W-H txt* = *a b c d ff<sub>2</sub>*  
*g<sub>2</sub> q* but not the others and no vulgates. All other Greeks  
 oppose with *ελεγον*.  
 xxviii. 14. *υπο του ηγεμονος* (*pro επι του ηγ.*) BD 59 892 only with *W-H*  
*marg.* Cf *lat* "a praeside."  
 15. *αργυρια* (- *τα*) N\*B\*W *Sod*<sup>351 sol</sup> et *W-H txt*. Cf *lat*  
 "pecunia."

*ibid.* *σημερον + ημερας* BDL and Latin against *N* and the rest.

These three places coming so close together after a long while seem particularly interesting and noteworthy. Origen opposes *B* definitely in the last place and probably at xxviii. 14, certainly once out of twice there. This is again followed by :

- xxviii. 17. *προσεκυνησαν* (- *αυτω*) NBD 33 only and *latt* (except *q*) *vg Eus*  
*Chr* against all other Greeks + *αυτω* with *q syr* and Coptic.

Observe now from xxviii. 19 where *B* adds *ουν* with ΔΠ, and where *D* adds *νυν* (and some Latins both *ουν* and *νυν*), that this Latin text favoured by *B* was not of the purest most neutral stock, for *N* and all other Greeks add nothing, having *πορευθεντες* only with EVERY GREEK AND LATIN FATHER from *Irenaeus* to *Amphilochius*. And the same remark

applies to the βαπτισαντες of BD (*solī*; Soden adds none) *latt* in this verse against βαπτιζοντες of all the rest, and the same array of Fathers. I am sorry to say that Hort swallows ουν without marginal comment, and ventures to put βαπτισαντες in his margin.

*As to B and Coptic sympathy.*

[Again here observe W. Where W joins is for the Egyptian method of the possessive before the noun (vii. 24, 26) and for *iva* instead of *οπως* (viii. 34), which ρινα would appear in the bohairic column or at any rate be familiar to the ear of an Alexandrian].

This feature has been recognised to some extent, but many details have been overlooked which make for definite Coptic influence upon the parents of B, rather than for mere common basic sympathy with a Greek text underlying the Coptics.

Matt.

- i. 5. βοες                      NB Oxyr<sup>2</sup> *k sah boh W-H*
- ii. 21. εισηλθεν (*pro ηλθεν*)    NBC 157 273 *solī et sah (αηδωκ εηρδι) boh (αφι εδουη)*
- iii. 2. — και (*ante λεγων*)    NB *sah boh aeth g<sub>2</sub> q W-H Sod.*
- vii. 17. Amid vastly differing orders (see under NB in Part II for details) B alone with *vg<sup>Mq</sup>* gives us *Coptic* order καρπους ποιει καλους, bringing καλους last. Tischendorf does not notice this and Horner for some extraordinary reason is here absolutely silent. Yet Hort places this grandly in his margin. If anyone will take the trouble (it takes a good half hour) to run through the differing orders, he will rise from his examination convinced that B here does not alone retain a "neutral" order, but has "accommodated" at some time in his career. Soden adds no support for B.
24. αυτου την οικιαν    NBCWZ 1 33 892 *Orig sah boh (ex more copt) contra rell omn et latt την οικιαν αυτου.* [Anyone who will compare what N does elsewhere in this chapter (see Part II. under N and B) will bear me out that he sat there playing with the versions, ringing changes in *syr*, *lat* and *copt*, as well as improvising himself, as he does in the verse previous to this, adding πολλα to δαιμονια].
26. αυτου την οικιαν    NBWZ 1 604 892 *Sod<sup>allq</sup> sah boh (more copt). Contra rell et Orig (hoc loco)!*
- viii. 8. αποκριθεις δε    N\*B 33 372 *sah [non boh] W-H*  
           απεκριθη. και ειπεν    *syr et k*  
           και αποκριθεις    N<sup>b</sup> *C et rell et latt* } †

† This is rather a pretty picture in an unimportant place of my contention as to *k* (Tisch does not refer to it, so I wish to call attention to it).

Matt.

- viii. 18. οχλον B sah soli (et W-H txt) }  
 οχλους NB boh soli (τους οχλους boh) }

The rest πολυν οχλον, οχλον πολυν (W), πολλους οχλους or οχλους πολλους.

A curious place occurs at viii. 27 *fin* where NBW 1 33 892 *Eus Chr* W-H make the order αυτω υπακουουσιν against υπακουουσιν αυτω of all others, including coptic and the versions; *k* alone varies, with obaudientes† tantum, and Hil 1/2 obedisse. In Luke the order of all is also και υπακουουσιν αυτω, but B omits there with 604. Why this change of order in Matthew against coptic, latin and syriac? *d* is available again here for the first time and reads obaudiunt ei with the mass. Sod adds <sup>50</sup> to NBW.

Matt.

- viii. 34. ινα (pro οπως) BW alone and boh  $\Sigma\text{I}\text{N}\Delta$  (sah  $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ )  
 ix. 9. μαθθαιον NB\*D sah [non boh], so at x. 3 again  
 12 init. ο δε (-ησους) NBD 248 892 *d* sah [non boh] aeth<sup>Walt</sup>.  
 syr sin  
 32. κωφον (-ανθρωπον) NB 71 892 sah boh ( $\overline{\mu}\text{o}\text{r}\text{e}\beta\text{o}$ ) aeth syr  
 W-H contra rell omn.  
 x. 32. εν τοις ουρανοις (pro εν ουρ.) BCKV al. sah boh Cyr }  
 sed Orig 1/4  
 33. „ „ „ „ „ BVX al. sah boh Cyr sed } †  
 Orig 1/3  
 xi. 16. εν ταις αγοραις (pro εν αγορ.) NBZ (1) 124 157 892 al. }  
 W-H Sod. sah boh contra rell et Clem (sed εν τη αγορα)  
 D syr sah<sup>unus</sup>, in foro *d* latt aeth goth)  
 xii. 13. σου την χειρα (pro την χειρα σου) NBL min pauc and 892 is  
 the coptic manner. See above, and beyond for such preference  
 under "Genitive before the Noun in Luke."  
 17. ινα (pro οπως) NBCD 1 33 Orig *Eus* boh (see above, viii. 34)  
 22. See under "Change of Voice."  
 31. αφεθησεται υμιν τοις ανθρωποις B 1 [non 118-209] sah  
 syr<sup>hier</sup> Ath [non boh latt]

- xiii. 28. οι δε (-δουλοι) B 157 *g* h boh sah [non aeth rell] W-H txt

This seems to be a nicety of "pairs." ο δε εφη αυτοις..ο δε λεγουσιν αυτω. Very pretty but not legitimate. So both coptics "But he, said he to them..but they, said they to him." It is ridiculous to suppose that all others added this δουλοι. Besides Manich<sup>Epiph</sup> opposes B and has it.

Matt.

- xiv. 3. +τοτε B<sup>ol</sup> cum fam 13 Sod<sup>7050</sup> et txt, et sah diserte (εν τουτω τω καιρω); et cf *k* "cum detinuisset."

† This may be primitive.

‡ Observe the different character of support to B in these three places while sah boh are constant.

This is clear B and *sah* sympathy and nothing else. *Boh* does not join nor *Σ* nor D nor W nor others.

Matt.

- xvi. 21.  $\overline{\iota\varsigma} \overline{\chi\varsigma}$  (*pro o ihsous*) *Σ*\*B\* *Sod*<sup>1178</sup> *sah* 2/3 *boh*<sup>omn</sup> *praeter duo* against the rest, and they themselves corrected,† and against the other versions. (Dominus Jesus *aeth*, as often = merely "Jesus.") *Σ*<sup>ca</sup> 892 *Orig Iren*<sup>int</sup> *plane om.* W-H follow *Σ*B.
- xvii. 8.  $\overline{\iota\nu}$  *αυτον μονον* *Σ*  
*αυτον*  $\overline{\iota\nu}$  *μονον* B 604 *Sod*<sup>050</sup> } *pro τον ιησουν μονον.* This is rendered perfectly clear from the coptics, where *αυτος* is tacked on to the word for *μονος*. The Latins do not do it, so we may clearly refer this as to both *Σ* and B to Coptic I think or possibly Syriac.‡ Following so close on xvi. 21 it is instructive.
14. *ελθοντων (- αυτων)* *Σ*BZ 1 124 245 *Sod*<sup>1132</sup> *sah*
- xxviii. 1 *init.* *εν εκεινη δε* BM *Sod*<sup>1442</sup> and only *sah* 3/6 *boh*<sup>omn</sup>
- 11 *vers om.* *Σ*BL\* 1\* [*non fam*] 13 [*non fam*] 33 892\* *e ff*<sub>1</sub> *sah boh*<sup>pl</sup> *sy* *hier sin* *Orig* (*contra rell et syrr rell latt rell aeth*?). D has the verse and also W very specially. Observe the spacing *fo* 65 in W. (*Sod*<sup>050</sup> also omits.)
14. *πατρος μου (pro πατρος υμων)* BFHIΓ *al. sah boh*, only *r*<sub>2</sub> of Latins, *arm aeth*, *sy* *sin* (only of *sy*) and *Orig*<sup>bis</sup>
16. Matter of order: *παραλαβε (ετι) ενα η δυο μετα. σ.* B *ff*<sub>1</sub> *boh sah* only [*non al. Sod*]
27. *του δουλου (- εκεινου)* B *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 1 124 only with *sah* 4/7. It may be useful to mention the *sah* MSS as they are very definite here. They are 111 112 114 f<sup>l</sup>. (*αυτου sy* *cu sin*, *et aliter pers*).
31. *> αυτου οι συνδουλοι* B<sup>so1</sup> *cum sah boh*
- xix. 16. *σχω (pro εχω vel κληρονομησω)* BD *Sod*<sup>281</sup> *Orig* 1/2. Coptic has no verb for *εχω*, and although *σχω* probably approximates the Latin here, it is interesting to see that *sah* has *ερεχι* "take" as against *boh*  $\overline{\pi\tau\alpha\epsilon\rho\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\omega\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota}$  "inherit" transliterating the Greek of *Σ*L and some.
21. *τοις πτωχοις (pro πτωχοις)* BD only with *sah boh* against all the rest and against *Clem Orig*<sup>ter</sup> with a host of Fathers.
29. *του εμου ονοματος (pro του ονοματος μου)* *Σ*B *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 101 124 [*non fam*] § *sah boh et W-H txt.*
- ibid.* *πολλαπλασιονα (pro εκατονταπлас.)* BL *Sod fam* *φ*<sup>c</sup> *sah sy* *hier Orig*<sup>pluries</sup> *sol*<sub>i</sub> W-H *txt* [*non Σ rell*]

† So it is not likely that either of the mss *Σ* or B influenced *boh* or *sah*, seeing that the corrections stared the copts in the face. Obs. a place like xxvii. 4 where *αθων* is used by *Σ*B\* and the mass, while *δικαιον* is transliterated by *sah*.

‡ *Sy* uses the same expression xvii. 19; not so coptic.

§ Therefore, as I supposed, the Matthaean recension of 124 was revised in Egypt.



Matt.

- xx. 9. *ελθοντες δε* B<sup>sol</sup> et *W-H txt cum sah boh*<sup>duob</sup>: (*r<sub>2</sub> syr cu non sin*).  
 16. — πολλοι γαρ εισι κλητοι ολιγοι δε εκλεκτοι. NBLZ 36 892  
*sah boh*<sup>pl</sup> (*aeth aliq, non Walton*) against all the rest and  
*lattomn syr<sup>omn</sup> arm Orig<sup>bis</sup> hoc loco* (*Barn Hom<sup>clm</sup> Clem*).  
 This is supposed to be dragged in by the mass from xxii. 14,  
 but *Orig* quotes twice at xx. 16, and thrice at xxii. 14. It  
 seems a clear "Egyptian" removal at xx. 16, for neither  
 D nor W nor *e* nor *r<sub>2</sub>* nor *ff* countenance the removal here and  
*syr lat* are a unit for the clause.  
 34. >αυτων των ομματαυ B<sup>sol</sup> et *copt* (*contra Orig*)  
 xxi. 11. >ο προφητης ιησους NBD 157 *sah boh arm Orig 1/3 Eus*  
 against all the rest and *latt syr<sup>r</sup> aeth Orig 2/3*

This Origenistic division is most illuminating in all these places,  
 leaving NBD alone with Egypt for a base. (Cf BD *supra* xix. 21).

It is immediately followed by

- xxi. 12. *εις το ιερον* (— του θεου) NBL 13 [*non fam*] 33 73 604 892 *b*,  
*sah boh* again, with *arm aeth Orig 2/5 Meth Chr Hil*, but seems  
 to be a clear harmonistic omission, for του θεου is absent from  
 Mark (xi. 15) and Luke (xix. 45). (*Sod* adds <sup>050</sup> al aliq.)

Note how closely NB stick to *copt* here, with *Origen* again a poor  
 wavering witness.

In such cases Tischendorf (as Turner has pointed out in a general  
 way) abandoned his favourite N with great judgment and placed του θεου  
 in his text, while poor Hort, abject slave to his standard, can only find  
 room for του θεου in his margin. The Revisers restore it to their text (but  
 in Souter's note he says "13 &c. 33 700," implying the family 13,  
 whereas the other members do not support 13).

As to xxi. 13, I have to refer to another place under "Historic  
 Present." I have followed Dr. Schmiedel's advice in making such  
 subdivisions, but it has much inconvenience for the running argument.  
 I state it once for all here.† Observe then that ποιειτε of NBL *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 124  
 892 is the reading of *boh* (against *sah*). Therefore in what precedes here  
 as to Coptic, *boh* is just as old as *sah*.

- xxi. 15. +τους (*ante κραζοντας*) NBDLN (*sah*) *boh arm syr* against  
 the rest and the usual cursives and *Orig Meth*. *Boh* is very  
 definite here. Tisch. omits to add the versions.

Again Hort follows what is really a version tradition here against  
 Origen and Methodius, L and the rest.

- xxi. 29/31 *vers invert*. B *pauc. cum sah boh etc*.  
 xxii. 37. ο δε εφη αυτω NBL 33 *sah boh Orig<sup>int</sup>* (against D *latt εφη*  
*αυτω ιησους*, and ο δε ιησους εφη αυτω of most, and ο δε ιησους  
*ειπεν αυτω* of some)

† A more elaborate subdivision will be found elsewhere including "Form," which  
 sometimes finds a place under the unique readings of B.

Matt.

xxii. 39 *init.* δευτερα (-δε) **N**\*B 157 *sah*<sup>111</sup> *boh*<sup>C1B2</sup> *W-H*. There seems no other attestation. (*Sod* adds <sup>371</sup> [δ or ε?] <sup>243</sup>). Other *sah* and *boh* could have ΔΕ, but some *boh* ΤΕ. Latins have *autem*, while *syrr diatess* and *Cypr* have και δευτερα. Mark xii. 31 = "δευτερα αυτη," hence this seems Marcan influence, for Luke x. 27 continues simply "και τον πλησιον."

xxiii. 9. > υμων ο πατηρ **NBUΣ** 33 892 *Sod*<sup>s</sup> <sup>371</sup> <sup>1225</sup> *Eust* 48 *al*<sup>s</sup> *Nyss* et *sah boh W-H* et *Sod txt* (contra *rell gr et syr lat ο πατηρ υμων*)  
 38. -ερημος **BL** *ff*<sub>2</sub> *sah boh syr sin*. I place this here as it does not seem basic at all but Egyptian. *Orig* who (doubtfully) supports once with *Cyr* 2/3 is contradicted by *Orig*<sup>saepo</sup> *Eus*<sup>saepo</sup> as well as *Clem* and *Cypr* and all other Greeks and Latins. *ff*<sub>2</sub> appears here owing to its Egyptian influences. I do not place this under "Harmonistic omissions," although at St. Luke xiii. 35 most authorities omit, for there a good many add. It probably belongs in St. Matthew and not in St. Luke. **BL** *ff*<sub>2</sub> *sah boh syr sin* are only complicating the synoptic problem here once more. *Soden* has no new witness for omission.

*Diatess* § 41 is quoting from Matthew and has *ερημος*.

*W-Hort* here in Matt. exclude *ερημος* from the text but have it in the margin. Souter has it in his text but puts a footnote "*om. ἔρημος.*" He gives the evidence of **BL**, adding a black letter **L**(<sup>vt ff</sup><sub>2</sub>). The *ff*<sub>2</sub> is so small one can hardly see it, and black letter L makes one think it has large Latin support, whereas *ff*<sub>2</sub> here is representing Egypt, against *e* and all the rest and all vulgates.

xxiv. 31, 37, 38, 39 taken together have some significance.

40. > εσονται δυο **N**\*B *p*<sup>scr</sup> 892 *h r r*<sub>2</sub> *vy*<sup>JRW</sup> and *sah*, against *boh* and the rest. (For the conjunction *h r r*<sub>2</sub> see under Lists for **N** and **B** at xxiv. 11 as well as here. This seems conclusive as to *h* for Irish origin. No other Old Latins join them; and observe the full array of *a h n r r*<sub>2</sub> at xxvi. 56). Add *Soden*<sup>duo</sup>

48. > μου ο κυριος **NBCDIL** 33 157 209? 409 604 892 *Sod*<sup>al.</sup> *perpauc*. *Ephr*? *sah boh*

*ibid.* χρονιζει (-ελθειν) **NB** 6 33 604 892 *sah boh Ephr Iren*<sup>int</sup> (against all the rest and against all Latins but *Iren*<sup>int</sup> which shows this is *Iren*<sup>sr</sup> pure)

xxv. 1. υπαντησιw (pro απαντ.) **NBCZ** 1 [*non fam*] 892 (*Meth* 1/2) [*male Soden de 157*] Cf *e2pen boh*

This in connection with xxv. 6 *fin* εξερχεσθε εις απαντησιw (-αυτου) by **NB** 604 alone + *Cyr Meth* shows such a nice appreciation of the difference between υπαντησιw αυτου and απαντησιw without αυτου that it should be carefully noted (*Z* is wanting in verse 6), because both coptics and all others and all Latin have αυτου in verse 6 *fin*.

Cf in this connection xxvi. 42 παρελθειν (-απ εμου).

Note further that at

Matt.

viii. 28. *υπηντησαν αυτω* is used by all on this the first occurrence of the expression.

34.	<i>εις υπαντησιν του ιησου</i>	Σ 33	} <i>εις απαντησιν</i> τω ι. <i>Sod</i> <sup>8 459</sup>
	<i>εις υπαντησιν τω ιησου</i>	B 1 <i>Sod</i> <sup>050</sup>	
	<i>εις συναντησιν του ιησου</i>	C 157 892 <i>y<sup>scr</sup> Cyr</i>	
	<i>εις συναντησιν τω ιησου</i>	<i>Rell omh</i>	

xxviii. 9. *υπηντησεν αυταις* is used again by Σ\*BCΠΣ<sub>1</sub> *fam* 1 *fam* 13 (*partim*) 604 892 *min*<sup>15</sup> *Orig Cyr* against *απηντησεν αυτ.* of the rest

Mark

v. 2. *υπηντησεν αυτω* ΣBCDGLΔ 1 *fam* 13 28 *al*<sup>20</sup> *Dam* against *απηντησεν* of ΑΠ *unc*<sup>s</sup> *al. pl*

xiv. 13. *απαντησει υμιν* unchanged by all (except υπ. 28 *Sod*<sup>1132</sup>)

Luke

viii. 27. *υπηντησεν (- αυτω)* ΣBEWΞ 1 33 157 604 *al*<sup>10</sup> (*rell υπηντησεν + αυτω praeter Γ al. pauc απηντ.*)

ix. 37. *συνηντησεν αυτω* All (except D *συνελθειν* R *συνηντησαν*)

xiv. 31. *υπαντησαι τω μετα* ΣABDRXΔ 1 33 *fam* 13 (*partim*) 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> 892 *Sod*<sup>duo</sup>

*απαντησαι τω μετα* LWΓΑΠ *unc*<sup>s</sup> *al. pl Bas*

xvii. 12. *υπηντησαν αυτω* ΣN *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *fam* 1 *fam* 13 [non 124] 157 [male *Sod*] 892 *al*<sup>0</sup> *Bas Dam*

*υπηντησαν (- αυτω)* L et *Sod txt*

*απηντησαν αυτω* AWXΓΔΑΠ *unc*<sup>s</sup> *al. pl et R-V* }

*απηντησαν (- αυτω)* B et W-H *txt*

[οπου ησαν D d e (*latt*)]

xxii. 10. *υπαντησει υμιν* CXL *al. pauc* 892 *Sod*<sup>s 71</sup>

*απαντησει υμιν* D 124 (*ἀπ.*) *al. pauc. Orig*

*συναντησει υμιν* ΣABPRWΓΔΑΠ *unc*<sup>s</sup> *al. pl*

John

iv. 51. *υπηντησαν αυτω* ΣBCDKLW 1 *al*<sup>20</sup> et 892

*απηντησαν αυτω* ΑΓΔΑΠ *unc*<sup>s</sup> *al. pl Orig Cyr Chr*

xi. 20. *υπηντησεν αυτω* by all (except *Sod*<sup>duo</sup>)

30. *υπηντησεν αυτω* by all (except one)

xii. 1<sup>a</sup>. *εις υπαντησιν αυτω* ΣBEFHM<sup>Q</sup>SWΓΔΔ *al. pl*

*εις απαντησιν αυτω* AKUΠ *al*<sup>50</sup> *Orig*<sup>bis</sup> (*αυτου Sod*<sup>1443</sup>)

*εις συναντησιν αυτω* LX 157 *al. pauc* }

*εις συναντησιν αυτου* DG *al*<sup>8</sup>

18. *υπηντησεν αυτω* by all (*υπηντησαν D c d*)

Acts

x. 25. *συναντησας αυτω* by all (*συναντησαντα αυτω* two)

xvi. 16. *υπαντησαι ημιν* ΣBCE *min*<sup>s</sup> *Orig* (*συναπαντ.* two)

*απαντησαι ημιν* ADHLP *al. pl Eustath Chr*

Acts

- xx. 22. συναντησονται μοι **N**BLP *al. pl Ath Chr* (**NB** εμοι)  
 συναντησαντα μοι ADEH *al.*  
 συμβησομενα μοι C *min*<sup>8</sup>  
 xxviii. 15. εις υπαντησιν υμων **N**\* *sic* (ημων Sod<sup>duo</sup>) }  
 εις υπαντησιν ημων 40 }  
 εις απαντησιν ημων ABHLP**N**<sup>c</sup> *etc Chr Thpyl* 1/2 }  
 εις απαντησιν ημων I *min*<sup>28</sup> *Thpyl* 1/2 }

1 Thess.

- iv. 17. εις υπαντησιν τω χριστω εις αερα D\*E\*FG }  
 εις υπαντησιν τω κυριω εις αερα D<sup>b</sup> }  
 εις συναντησιν του κυριου εις αερα Epiph  
 εις απαντησιν του κυριου εις αερα **NB** *rell Orig*<sup>bis</sup> *Hipp Dial*  
*Eus*<sup>bis</sup> *Bas al.*

Heb.

- vii. 1. συναντησας, Heb vii. 10 συνητησεν by all

Anyone who will have the patience to go through this list will see the drift at once. Until the list is drawn up we are at sea. Now it appears that *υπανταω* is purely Johannine, that St. Luke rather favours *συνανταω* (as shown by Acts x. 25, xx. 22; Luke ix. 37, xxii. 10), but also used *υπαντ.* or *απαντ.* elsewhere, where the mss try to confuse us. St. Mark uses *απανταω* xiv. 13, and the mss are divided as to *απαντ.* or *υπαντ.* at v. 2. St. Matthew uses *υπαντησαν* in viii. 28, where all are agreed, and doubtless *συναντησιν* at viii. 34, which **NB** wish to change to *ιπ*. He seems afterwards to employ *απαντ.* but the mss wish to harmonise his passages (or prefer the Johannine expression) and so confuse us at xxv. 1 and xxviii. 9. St. Matthew therefore uses all three expressions interchangeably and this has caused the trouble. I have no hesitation, after making up this list, of charging wilful change by **NB** at Matthew viii. 34, xxv. 1, xxviii. 9 (probably Mark v. 2, Luke xiv. 31) and Acts xvi. 16, where *Eustath*† contradicts *Origen*. Certainly *someone* is revising. Is it Antioch or Alexandria or Caesarea? Well, observe Luke xvii. 12 and Acts xxviii. 15 for the keys and there will be found **N** and B opposing each other! There seems to be no kind of doubt in view of the wavering courses of L and Π and C and X that accommodation and revision went on in the different places. Instead of "neutrally" keeping clear of these matters, **NB** run to meet difficulty and again obscure the issue for us in some of these passages, and hence a text founded on **NB** obscures the problem of the varying synoptic language (see Luke xvii. 12 B & *W-H soli*, L & *Sod soli*!).

Epiphanius shows us at 1 Thess. iv. 17 how carelessly he differentiated between the language of one or of another passage.

After this digression we continue as to coptic sympathy:—

† Nor is Eustathius' text of Acts any common "Antioch" revision. He has a most peculiar cast alone with D in one of the few places which survive in his writings.

Matt.

- xxv. 3. *αι γαρ* (*pro αι δε* Z 157 *it*<sup>pl</sup>, *αι ουν* D *d ff*<sub>2</sub>, *αιτινες* X *plur*)  
**NBCL** 33 892 *boh sah*
6. — *ερχεται* **NBCDLZ** 604 892 *sah boh d Meth* 1/2 *Cyr* [*contra*  
*rell omn et syr lat*]
- xxvi. 28. — *καινης* (*ante διαθηκης*) **NBLZ** 33 *Sod*<sup>050 8371</sup> *boh*<sup>unus</sup> [*non sah,*  
*cf "Pistis"*] *Cyr*, against all the rest and *Origen Iren.* This  
hardly belongs in this list, but I do not know where to place  
it. I do not charge this as a deliberate omission, yet it looks  
like one. The evidence is overwhelming for the reception of  
*καινης*, which Hort excludes. The Oxford edition of 1910  
also excludes, but Souter gives the evidence, actually ranking  
"102" for omission. I should have thought 102 was exploded  
long ago as being merely a collation of B. Gregory in his  
*Emendanda* removed 102 everywhere. Souter adds *Cypr* for  
omission, as Von Soden (*e* is wanting). Hitherto *Cypr* had  
been given by *Sabatier* and *Tisch* on the other side.
45. *ιδου + γαρ* **BE** *p*<sup>scr</sup> = *sah syr sin Ath*<sup>bis</sup> †
55. *καθημεραν* (— *προς υμας*) **NBL** 33 604 892 *sah boh syr*  
*sin Cypr*<sup>bis</sup> *Orig*<sup>int</sup> 1/3 against all others and against Latin.
71. *ουτος* (— *και*) **NBD** *Sod*<sup>1246</sup> [*non* 604] *sah syr sin* (against all else).
- xxvii. 2. *πιλατω* (— *ποντιω*) **NBLΣ** 33 *sah boh syr Orig Petr.* This  
is a curious omission against the serried ranks of the other  
Greeks (and W and Φ replacing the missing Greek of D here)  
and the Latins, on this the first mention of the name. The  
*sah boh syr* connection (in the absence of the Latins) does not  
mean that it is necessarily basic. It is to be seen abundantly  
elsewhere that *syr sin* and *sah* hang together, not always for  
the purest text. *Orig* with *Petr* confirm it as Alexandrian, but  
whether "neutral" or not is another question.
23. — *ηγεμων* **NB** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 33 69 [*non fam*] *sah* [*non boh*] *syr*<sup>hier</sup> *arm*  
(*syr*<sup>sin</sup>) *W-H*
42. *βασιλευς ισραηλ εστιν* (— *ει*) **NBDL** 33 892 *d sah* (against  
*boh* and everything else including *syr sin Eus Ps-Ath*)
46. *ελωει ελωει* **B** *et sah literatim soli* } *cf Marc*  
*ελωι ελωι* **Σ** *et boh literatim cum* 33 *al. pauc vg*<sup>aliqua</sup> } xv. 34
- In Mark xv. 34 both **NB** have *ελωι ελωι*, while *sah* repeats *ελωει*  
*ελωει* and *boh* *ελωι ελωι*, but the *syr* differentiates (with the Greeks) as  
between Matthew and Mark. This tiny place therefore affords a con-  
siderable clue. It is probable that B and *sah* are closer in St. Matthew  
than elsewhere; in other words, sympathetic readings, although  
including *syr sin* or others, probably derive from *sah*, at any rate in

† "But we have not been able to recognise as Alexandrian any readings of B in any book of the New Testament which it contains." Hort, vol. ii. p. 150. Hort did not look very far. How about Athanasius here?

Matthew. Similarly, as often before, **N** runs with *boh* here. It is probable that **N** had before him either *sah* AND *boh*, or an edition of *boh* which was nearer to *sah* than our surviving *boh* MSS show.

Matt.

xxvii. 46. *λεμα* **NBL** 33 273 604 *Evst* 21 22 *et boh* (*al. boh ελε* cum *sah*). The rest *λεμα* or *λειμα*, and *λεμα* D

*ibid.* *σαβακτανει* **B**<sup>sol</sup> *vid cum* 22? *al<sup>2</sup> sah* (*pro σαβαχ. rel*)

51. Order: *εσχισθη* (*απ'*) *ανωθεν εως κατω εις δυο* (*hoc loco*) **BC\*L** *sah boh aeth* (As *syr sin* omits *κατω εις δυο* and **1** *Orig Eus* omit *εις δυο* this can only come from coptic). [**N** goes with the rest and Latin order, placing *εις δυο* after *εσχισθη*.]

58. *αποδοθηναι* (*-το σωμα*) **NBL** *min*<sup>15</sup> against all the rest and the Latins and *arm aeth goth syr pesh Orig*<sup>int</sup>. The support is confined to *syr sin* and the *coptics* which include *αυτο* in the verb, while *aeth* is very definite against them. When *aeth* has shown such intense sympathy with **N** and **B** (being alone with **B** in Matthew three times, alone with **N** over a dozen times) it seems fair to bring it into play in a case like this.

xxviii. 6 *fin.* *εκειτο* (*-ὁ κυριος*) **NB** 33 *Sod*<sup>tres</sup> *e sah boh arm aeth syr sin Orig*<sup>int</sup> *Cyr* against the rest and **D** *d*, all Latins but *e*, and *syr pesh pers* (*Aeth* "sepultus fuit," the Latins "positus erat," but *e* "jacebat," and observe coptic imperfect).

The *e* recension hangs absolutely to **NB**, for at xxviii. 8 *e* uses *abissent* (*απελθουσαι* **NBCL** *fam* 13 33) for *exierunt* of all other Latins (and *εξελθουσαι* all other Greeks).

See again xxviii. 14 *-αυτον* **NB** *Sod*<sup>50</sup> 33 *Orig*<sup>his</sup> and *e* only, against all else, all Latins, *syr copt* and *Cyr*<sup>hier</sup>

Add to the coptic list the places under "Change of number" where **NB** prefer the plural. In every case this has the countenance of the coptic.

### Traces of Syriac.

Matt.

xi. 23. *> αι εν σοι γενομεναι* **B** (instead of *αι γενομεναι εν σοι* of all other Greeks and Latins and Coptic) is found to be the order of *syr sin* (against *syr cu*). *Syr sin* says "that in you were seen," but gives this order. It is a curious touch, not observed by Mrs. Lewis in her English translation of *syr sin*, not noted by Horner in his notes to *sah*, but standing plainly in Burkitt's notes to *syr cusin* (*Eng* and *Syriac* sides) and in Merx' translation.

I have been accused of seeing fanciful resemblances which are merely coincidences and at first sight this might appear to be a mere coincidence. I am glad of the opportunity to be more precise and to show that these things are not mere coincidences and that the study of them is an absolute necessity (quite overlooked hitherto) if we are to make progress in tracing the text-history behind Origen.

It is to be noted then that **NBC** 1 33 and a few cursives change *εμειναν* to *εμεινεν* in this same verse against fourteen uncials and the mass. The plural number is supported by all the Latins, and *sah* of necessity for that version has *Sodom and Gomorra*. The Greek of all is *εν σοδομοις*, but the Syriacs with the *diatess arab* have *in Sodom* and a singular verb. The bohairic has *ⲉⲛ ⲥⲟⲩⲟⲙⲟⲩⲁ* and a plural verb. Syriac then and **NBC** are in sympathy here alone, whatever we may think of the whole situation, for *εμειναν* may possibly be revision here for a basic *εμεινεν*. Yet how is it that D, all the rest, and all the Latins persist in the plural?

The only point I wish to make at this place is, however, that as *syr* and **NBC** are shown alone together here for *εμεινεν* (against the otherwise friendly Coptic and Latin) it is clear the previous point as to special order in the verse with *syr sin* is well taken. *Horner* and *Tisch* are both silent as to the versions, which is a pity.

Matt.

- xiii. 36. *διασαφησον* (*pro φρασον*) **NB** *Sod*<sup>7050 φ<sup>a</sup></sup> [none of the sympathising cursives] *Orig* and *syr copt*. *Obs.* also the use of the word by *Clem*<sup>alex</sup> (*Strom* vi. 15: *καὶ κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα διασαφoῦντες τὰς γραφάς*). [In xv. 15 Greeks all *φρασον*. *Copt* and *syr* use the same word as in xiii. 36, Latins vary as in xiii. 36]. Both *W-H* and *Sod* place *διασαφησον* in their texts.
- xii. 22. See under "Change of voice." B shares (alone among Greeks and Latins) the active voice of *syr copt aeth*.
- 31. *αφεθησεται υμιν τοις ανθρωποις* B 1 *Sod*<sup>1341</sup> and *syr*<sup>hier</sup> *sah Ath* [*non boh non latt*]. The other Syriacs express, as often, "to sons of men," which may have given rise to it. But perhaps place this under Coptic (*sah*) quite definitely, since *Athanasius* also witnesses. Note this as to Alexandrian readings of B.

Another peculiar case occurs soon after in sympathy with the versions, partially, at—

- xii. 36. *λεγω δε υμιν οτι παν ρημα αργον δ λαλησουσιν οι ανθρωποι*. So **NB** *Sod*<sup>1341</sup> and *copt syr*. The common Gk text read by nearly all is *δ εαν λαλησωσιν*. **NB** drop *εαν* and change the subj. to the indicative. The Latins all say *quod* for *o εαν* (except *h quodcunque*) with *Iren*<sup>int</sup> and *Cypr*, but have the *subjunctive*, so they no doubt read *δ εαν λαλησωσιν*. *Winer* has no remarks on this peculiar place for **NB**, nor has *Blass*, although the latter speaks of it (p. 283) in connection with *anacoluthon*. We must draw our own conclusions, and those are that the *syr* and *coptic* versions influenced **NB**. There is much difference between "which men *may* speak" (*Lat Gr*) and "which men *shall* speak" (*syr copt NB*). D also omits *εαν* and has *λαλousιν* with *d*. C has *εαν* but writes *λαλησουσιν*. Observe now that L and *Orig* are against **NBD**, writing *o αν λαλησωσιν*. (*W-H* follow **NB** without marginal comment.)

Matt.

- xii. 47 *vers om.* **N**\*BLΓ 126 225 238 400\* *Sod*<sup>tres</sup> (not particularly sympathetic cursives otherwise) *ff<sub>1</sub> k syr cu sin sah* (against *boh aeth syr pesh arm* and the rest of the Latins). I place this example here because *ff<sub>1</sub> k* are so thoroughly syriac in base it is probably the common base of **NB** *sah* coming out here, through *syr*, rather than an "improvement" in their time. Of course this can also be grouped under "Omissions from homoioteleuton" as *ver* 46 and *ver* 47 both end with *λαλησαι* in most Greeks, but in *ver* 46 BCZ end *λαλησαι αυτω*, while **N** omits.
- xiv. 24. *σταδιους πολλους απο της γης* (*pro meson της θαλασσης vel ην εις meson της θαλ.*) B (*Sod*<sup>550</sup>) *fam* 13 *syr sah boh*
29. *και ηλθεν* (*pro ελθειν*) BC\* 604 *Sod*<sup>quinque</sup> *syr* (ut veniret lat)
- xvi. 4. *αιτει* (*pro ζητει*) B<sup>sol</sup> (*syr* word serves for either expression but actually *pers*<sup>int</sup> gives this *petit* following other B sympathy)
- xvii. 8. *αυτον ιν μονον* B<sup>sol</sup> *cum Sod*<sup>550</sup> (and **N**<sup>sol</sup> *ιν αυτον μονον*) Cf. *syr* and *copt* and see under "Coptic influence" as well.
15. *κυριε ελεησον μου τον υιον μου* B<sup>sol</sup>. Cf. *syr sol κυριε μου ελεησον με · ο υιος μου . . . et aeth Domine miserere mei filique mei*
- xviii. 19. *εξ υμων* (*pro υμων*) **NBDL** *al. pauc. syr latt*
- xxii. 9/10/11/12. See under "Improvement." As *sah* repeats the *beth* in verses 9, 11 and 12 and *syr* does not, it is probable that *syr* is the chief influence in **NBL** in verse 10.
- xxv. 23. > *πιστος ης* B *h r syr soli* (*et hoc loco et ver* 21 *h r syr*; in *ver* 21 *vg*<sup>Q</sup>) *quia super pauca fidelis c* (-ης)
42. I do not know whether we ought to attribute + *και* before *εδιψησα* here to syriac influence, but only BL add with *syr pesh diatess* and *aeth* (not exhibited in Walton's translation, but present in the text). [*W-H txt*].
- Add to the above an interesting place at vi. 1 where for *ελεημοσυνην* of most Greeks and *k*, *δικαιοσυνην* is read by **N**<sup>b</sup>BD† *it*<sup>pl</sup> *syr sin hier*, while *δοσιν* is given by that early corrector **N**<sup>a</sup> with *boh* and *syr cu* (*δωρα Ephr*). The end of the words for "gift" and "righteousness" is the same in Syriac. *δικαιοσυνην* and *δοσιν* probably grew out of a revision, comparing with *syr*. But in verse 3 all have *ελεημοσυνην*.
- [Observe the scant support **NB** get from the ms W in all the above.]

### As to "Form."

I have neglected most small matters of form, as *ειπαν*, *καταβατω*, *μεταβα*, *φοβεισθε*, *μοιχευθηναι* (*pro μοιχασθαι*), etc.

I might call attention to Matt. xxviii. 4 where **NBC**\*DL 33 have *εγενηθησαν* and the rest *εγενοντο* with *Dion*? *Eus*, while *syr sin* omits the verb altogether.



Observe Mark i. 27 *εθαμβηθησαν* **NB** and all except D who with *Orig* writes *εθαμβησαν*, while W alone has *εθανμαζον*. (In Luke iv. 36 the expression is *και εγενετο θαμβος*).

### Synonyms.

Matt.

- xiii. 30. *αχρι* **N\***<sup>et c</sup> L *Chr* 1/3  
*εως* BD *Chr* 1/3 *Eulog*  
*μεχρι* C *rell et N<sup>b</sup> Chr* 1/3

See also

- xxviii. 15 *εως* **ND** 1 213 *Orig* 1/2  
*μεχρι* B *rell Orig* 1/2

C and D alone are constant respectively in both places.

This tells a tale of preferences.

*Cf* note on *περι/υπερ* under Luke vi. 28.

*Cf* Matt. xx. 20 *απ αυτου* (*pro παρ αυτου*) BD 604 (*latt sah*).

- xxi. 2. *κατεναντι* **NBCDLZΦ** 892 *min*<sup>10</sup> *Orig*<sup>bis</sup> *Eus* 1/2 (parallel Mark xi. 2 and Luke xix. 30 *κατεναντι* all)

*απεναντι* E *rell Orig*<sup>ed</sup> *Eus* 1/2

- xxvii. 24. *κατεναντι* BD *sol* et *W-H txt*

*απεναντι* **N** *rell et Acta Pil*

61. *κατεναντι* D<sup>sol</sup>

*απεναντι* **NB** *rell*

*επι* W<sup>sol</sup>

Mark

- xi. 2. *κατεναντι* *fere omn* (parallel Matt. xxi. 2, Luke xix. 30)

- xii. 41. *απεναντι* BU 33 *min*<sup>20</sup> *Dam*

*κατενωπιον* (*fam* 13)

*κατεναντι* **N** *rell et D et Orig*<sup>bis</sup>

- xiii. 3. *κατεναντι* *omn*

Luke

- xix. 30. *κατεναντι* *fere omn* (parallel Mark xi. 2, Matt. xxi. 2)

I think this tells the tale, without going outside the Gospels. In Matt. xxi. 2 *κατεναντι* has been borrowed from the parallels (Mark xi. 2, Luke xix. 30) where *κατεναντι* stands without variation. Why should "Antioch" vary uselessly in Matthew? It is the group **NBLZ** which "accommodated." The adhesion of D is nothing, for he prefers *κατεναντι* alone at Matt. xxvii. 61 and goes with B alone at Matt. xxvii. 24, while *Eus* is to be seen using *both* expressions in Matt. xxi. 2. I repeat:

Matt.

- xxi. 2. *κατεναντι* **NBCDLZ** *Orig* 1/2 *Eus* 1/2 (*contra rell et Orig* 1/2 *Eus* 1/2)

- xxvii. 24. *κατεναντι* BD *sol* (*contra rell omn*)

61. *κατεναντι* D *solus* (*contra rell omn*)

These are the only occasions where the word is used in St. Matthew. Could there be a prettier picture that *απεναντι* is Matthaean? In the only place where we have the conspiracy of **NBCDLZ** both *Orig* and *Eus*

are found to hold both readings, of which *κατεναντι* was preferred by the MSS. Where their testimony is absent B ventures to join D in one place and not in the other. D alone is consistent in all three places. If D be right, the others are clearly wrong in not giving us *κατεναντι* in all three places.

But I am pretty sure that *απεναντι* is Matthæan, and *κατεναντι* Marcan. Note again the Marcan wording :

Mark

- xi. 2. *κατεναντι* all but a few scattering witnesses.
- xii. 41. *κατεναντι* all and 69-124 (and *κατενωπιον* 13-346-556) except  
BU *min*<sup>20</sup> *Dam απεναντι*
- xiii. 3. *κατεναντι* all

And note in St. Luke :

- xix. 30. *κατεναντι* all but a few scattering witnesses.

So that although B tries to obscure the issue again in Mark (where the absence of *ND* shows he is wrong) he cannot do it. *απεναντι* remains Matthæan, and *κατεναντι* Marcan and Lucan.

[In the epistles *κατενωπιον* is the expression. Hence the reading above of part of the 13 family.] But it is just in such places that our tables of synoptic wording have become muddled owing to the use of the Westcott and Hort text.

As to *απανταω, συνανταω, υπανταω* see under "Coptic" at Matthew xxv. 1.

### *Grammatical Changes :*

Of voice, of mood, of tense [and see separately for historic present],  
of case, of number, and of order.

### *Change of Voice.*

Matt.

- xii. 22. *προσηνεγκαν αυτω δαιμονιζομενον τυφλον και κωφον* B (*syr* *diatess sah boh aeth*) against all Greeks and Latins :  
*προσηνεχθη αυτω δαιμονιζομενος τυφλος και κωφος.*

This is a most important passage, for it is uncomplicated by the parallel Luke xi. 14 (*q.v.*). It also involves a *change of case*.

Hort has the temerity to place it in his text on the sole authority of B<sup>or</sup> and versions, against *ND* and all other Greeks and *all the Latins* conjoined. Soden now adds 1 (δ 30) and his 1444, but not *Sinai* 260.

Of many minor variations in this passage and in this verse we need not take account here. The plain fact remains that B followed the versions here with the active voice, and from the *form* it is *coptic* rather than *syr* which (with *ff*, *h*) expresses "and they brought to him a *certain* demoniac who was dumb and blind" (*syr pesh*; "blind and deaf" *syr cu*).

The matter is in a nutshell here for any who will examine it.

Matt.

- xix. 20. εφυλαξα (*pro* εφυλαξαμην) **NBDL** 1 22 *Ath*<sup>cod</sup> against the rest and *Origen Ath<sup>ed</sup> Chr.* In Mark x. 20 εφυλαξα is read by AD 28 892 *Clem Orig* (the more semitic *εποιησα* by *fam* 1 2<sup>pe</sup> *syr sin*, as *Ephr Aphr* in Matthew) but εφυλαξαμην by **NBrell**. In Luke xviii. 21 εφυλαξα by **NABL** *fam* 1 *Dial* against εφυλαξαμην D and the rest. The question may well be asked why *syr sin* uses *εποιησα* only in Mark, with *fam* 1 2<sup>pe</sup>. This Marcan recension must be further enquired into. *Servavi* is there used by *vg*<sup>DMQ</sup>. See further remarks under the head of "Improvement."

Observe at Matt. xxvii. 57 **NCDΣ** *fam* 1 33 273 604 *Evst* 17, but no others, change the voice of *εμαθητευσεν*, by B and the rest, to *εμαθητευθη*, probably because it follows *και αυτος*.

*μαθητευω* is essentially Matthaean (and only occurs elsewhere once in *Acts* xiv. 21 *μαθητευσαντες*). At Matt xiii. 52 we read *μαθητευθεις*, and at xxviii. 19 *μαθητευσατε*. I only mention it to show how liberties are taken, even when the combination **N** 1 33 604 includes D. B is absent here from this combination and on the active side, and rightly, for the classical synonyms are generally used in the active voice.

Ignatius (*ad Rom* § v) however: "Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀδικήμασιν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον μαθητεύομαι ἄλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δεδικαίωμαι" uses the middle.

### Change of Mood.

- xii. 36. ὁ λαλήσουσιν (*pro* ο εαν λαλήσωσιν) **NB** (and D *d o λαλουσιν*) against the rest and L and *Orig*. (See further under "Traces of Syriac.")

### Change of Participle Tense: aorist for present.

- xiii. 18. σπειραντος (*pro* σπειροντος) **N\*BXWΦ** 33 213 *Sod*<sup>al. 5</sup> *Evst* 4 *sol*i [seminantis *latt copt* (*syr*), D *rell* σπειροντος]  
 24. σπειραντι (*pro* σπειροντι) **NBMXWΔΠ** *min aliq latt pl et vers* [*sed seminanti d h k δ vg<sup>B</sup> et rell gr et D*]

It looks as if while *σπειραντι* may be right in xiii. 24 that *σπειροντι* is right in xiii. 18 and that **NBXWΦ** there are merely trying to equate the two passages, which should not equate but differ slightly.

- xiii. 23. συνιεις (*pro* συνιων) **NBD<sup>gr</sup>Φ** 238 892 *Sod*<sup>1341</sup> *Orig*. This appears very deliberate, as much for the sake of euphony with *σπαρεις* perhaps or for contradistinction of the pair *ακουων...συνιων* as for anything else...*σπαρεις ουτος εστιν ο τον λογον ακουων και συνιεις*. They do not write *συνεις* but *συνιεις* so that apparently the present participle is intended

Matt.

but in a different form. But see Rom. iii. 11 where *συνιων* is accepted by all.

Observe however B at Luke xxiv. 45 alone writing *συνειναι* (aor. inf.) for *συνιεναι*. (W *συνιεναι*.)

xxiii. 17. ο *αγιασας* (pro ο *αγιαζων*) **NBDZ** 892 *d* (*d* no doubt following his Gk, because all other Latins are against *d*). No cursives appear to join **NBDZ** besides 892, and *sah boh arm aeth* with the *Latin* appear to be against the change. I believe ο *αγιασας* to be an "improvement," followed however by *Soden* as well as *Hort*. The place, however, should be considered in connection with:

21. κατοικουντι (pro κατοικησαντι) **NBHSΦ** fam 1 fam 13 etc. txt. recept. latt copt et verss vid. Here **CDLZΓΔΠ** al *unc*<sup>7</sup> oppose with κατοικησαντι, as do **WΣΨ** and as does 892.

Here the versions reverse their position and go with **NB**. One's preference would be against **NB** in xxiii. 17 and with them in xxiii. 21 where they hold the *textus receptus*.

*Hort* has a very unsatisfactory solution, for he places *αγιασας* in his text verse 17 without marginal comment, while in verse 21 against κατοικουντι he has in his margin κατοικησαντι, so there seems to have been no system, unless *D* was considered an absolute balancing factor. *Soden* has *αγιασας* and κατοικησαντι.

### As to Infinitive.

Interchange of present and aorist infinitive and imperative. Examples:

xii. 10. θεραπευσαι	<b>NDLW</b>	} where <b>N</b> and <b>B</b> are on different sides.
θεραπευειν	<b>B</b> <i>rell</i>	
xiii. 3. σπειραι	<b>NDLMXW</b> <i>minn alig</i>	
σπειρειν	<b>B</b> <i>rell</i>	
xvi. 21. δεικνυναι	<b>B</b> <sup>sol</sup> cum <i>Orig</i> <sup>semel</sup>	[ <i>Soden</i> adds nothing]
δεικνυειν	<b>N</b> <i>rell et Orig</i> <sup>saepe</sup>	
xxiii. 23. αφειναι	<b>NBL</b> x <sup>scr</sup> 7 <sup>pe</sup>	
αφιεναι	<b>CD</b> <i>rell omn</i>	

As to infinitive tenses cf *Orig Eus ad Matt* xxiii. 37 επισυναξαί (pro επισυναγαγειν) and cf *Luc*.

### Imperative.

v. 42. δος	<b>NBDW</b> fam 13 [non 346] 892 <i>Sod</i> <sup>al.</sup> <i>pauc</i> <i>Clem</i>
διδου	<i>plur</i>
xix. 17. τηρει	<b>BD</b> soli et <i>W-H</i> txt (τηρηη 2 <sup>pe</sup> )
τηρησον	<b>NCL</b> <i>rell</i>

Matt.

xviii. 17. ειπον ειπε	NL Orig B <i>rell Cyr Bas</i>	{	So at xxii. 17. ειπον	LZ 33
			against ειπε	NB <i>rell</i>
			and xxiv. 3. ειπον	L 1 33
			against ειπε	NB <i>rell</i>
xxi. 2. πορευεσθε πορευθητε	NBDLZ C <i>rell</i>		<i>min</i> <sup>10</sup> Orig <i>Eus Chr</i>	

## Change of Case.

## Genitive Absolute.

- viii. 1. καταβαντος δε αυτου (*pro καταβαντι δε αυτω*) BC(Z)W *Sod*<sup>050</sup>  
and N<sup>b</sup> 892 *min aliq W-H & Sod txt*

As this is the first case to be noticed, it should be observed most carefully that N\* does not do this here. So that N opposes B at the very outset of a series in ch. viii. as to what is, I am convinced, a deliberate change. The point is that, as Burgon expressed it,† writing upon "style": "The attentive reader of S. Matthew's Gospel is aware that a mode of expression which is *six times repeated* in his viii<sup>th</sup> and ix<sup>th</sup> chapters is perhaps only once met with besides in his Gospel,—viz. in his xxi<sup>st</sup> chapter." Burgon referred to viii. 1 καταβαντι αυτω, viii. 5 εισελθοντι τω I., viii. 23 εμβαντι αυτω, viii. 28 ελθοντι αυτω, ix. 27 και παραγοντι τω I., ix. 28 ελθοντι δε, xxi. 23 και ελθοντι αυτω.

Now as B does not change *all* these datives, it might be thought that "Antioch" for some reason had made a harmonious whole and turned some genitives into datives in the supposed revision. It is just here that N offers its important testimony, for N does *not* use the genitive on the first occasion, thereby showing that it was *Egypt* which revised some of St. Matthew's datives, and not *Antioch* which cancelled some genitives. See further remarks under this head in St. Luke and St. John.

The second case occurs four verses later, at :—

- viii. 5. εισελθοντος δε αυτου NBCZ 892 *min aliq W-H & Sod txt*  
(Orig εισελθοντος του κυριου)  
but εισελθοντι δε αυτω all the rest  
viii. 28. και ελθοντος αυτου BC et N<sup>b</sup> Φ *Sod*<sup>050</sup> et *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> 892 *min*  
*pauc* (και ελθοντων αυτων N\*)  
και ελθοντι αυτω all the rest  
xxi. 23. και ελθοντος αυτου NBCDLΦ 1 *fam* 13 33 604 892  
*Sod*<sup>1094</sup> [*non al.*] Orig *bis W-H & Sod txt*  
και ελθοντι αυτω the rest

What is this but a Greek "improvement"? The small limited group speaks for itself.

† 'Last twelve verses of St. Mark,' p. 141.

It is noteworthy that *αὐτῷ διδασκοντι* remains unchanged later in the verse (although some Latins and Syr omit *διδασκοντι*, expressed by the other Latins *ad eum docentem*) so that the dative absolute rather hangs together throughout: *καὶ ἐλθοντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν προσήλθον αὐτῷ διδασκοντι...*

See beyond in the other Gospels as to Genitive Absolute, where we find the same revision to the Genitive in St. Mark, but nothing of the kind in St. Luke and St. John, because there were no datives to revise!

*Kind of Accusative Absolute (involving Change of Order).*

Matt.

xxvi. 40. L alone [*Soden* adds no others] changes *εὗρεν αὐτοὺς καθευδοντας* to *εὗρεν καθευδοντας αὐτοὺς*

Observe in the parallel in LUKE xxii. 45 **NBDLT** do the same: *εὗρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτοὺς* instead of *εὗρεν αὐτοὺς κοιμ.* Observe further that T is a graeco-sahidic, and therefore this Greek is contrary to coptic order. Note that *d* (alone of Latins) follows with *dormientes eos*,† and note that in Matt. xxvi. 43, Mark xiv. 37 40 no change is made in the order, and it becomes a personal matter where the change is made.

To this add:

xvii. 25. Among a tremendous variety of readings distributed over the "clever" MSS, the usual reading *οτε εισηλθεν* by the mass of Greeks is confirmed by the versions, but where D *d b n* use a dative (absolute) *εισελθοντι*, and 33 a genitive abs. *ελθοντων αυτων*, and *Sod*<sup>50</sup> *fam* 13 *εισελθοντων*, and *a* is content with *intranses*, **N** and **B** use an accusative, **N\*** *εισελθοντα εἰς την οικ.*, **BN**<sup>ca</sup> 1 892 *ελθοντα εἰς οικ.* In view of the immense variety of expressions [see under "Differences between **N** and **B**"] it must fairly be admitted that **NB** are improvising.

Now note:

xxvi. 71, where **NBLZ**. 892 *min pauc* do not care for an acc. absolute, for they suppress *αὐτον* in *ἐξελθοντα δε αὐτον*, the reading of nearly all others. D<sup>Φ</sup> *Eust* 17 have *ἐξελθοντος δε αὐτου* (*d* latin wanting) and the Latins mostly favour *exeunte autem illo*, but *a n* "egressus." As to *b r* they actually give us a Latin acc. absolute "exeuntem autem illum," *ff*<sub>2</sub> as printed "exeunte autem illum," *g*<sub>1</sub> "exeuntem illo."

W confirms *ἐξελθοντα δε αὐτον*, and from the Latin testimony it looks as if *αὐτον* had been suppressed by **NBLZ**.

† As if "dormientibus illis invenit eos."

But not elsewhere in the other four passages (Matt. and Mark), so that, as I have often thought throughout the study of Luke, the conjunction of D with **NBL** has a different significance in this Gospel to what it has elsewhere. It is not "Western" agreeing with **NBL**, but **NBLD** in St. Luke's Gospel the outcome of some common text tradition.

## Change of Case.

Matt.

- x. 16. *εις το μεσον λυκων* B (for *εν τῷ μεσω λυκων*) *ff<sub>1</sub> k vg<sup>B</sup>* (*Lucif*). This is clear "improvement" after *αποστελλω υμας*. Cf also Matt. xxvii. 5. (Note D<sup>sol</sup> at Luke x. 3 *μεσον λυκων*).
25. *τω οικοδεσποτη* and *τοις οικιακοις* B\* alone (*προ τον οικοδεσποτην* and *τους οικιακους*) (governed by *επεκαλεσαν*); common text is *εκαλεσαν*, but nearly all authorities are for *επεκαλ*. *επικαλεω* would seem to favour a dative, while *καλεω* (except in middle) takes accusative. Lachmann and *W-H mg* follow B.
- xiv. 19. *επι του χορτο* **NBC\*IWΣΦ** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 1 22 33 *al*<sup>10</sup> *Orig*<sup>quater</sup>  
*W-H Sod txt*  
*επι τον χορτον* D 16 61 892 *latt sah boh pl aeth arm (syr cu)*  
*επι τους χορτους* C<sup>2</sup>E *rell unc omn min pl [non verss praeter boh<sup>B</sup> syr sin<sup>1</sup>]*  
*επι την (της) γην (γης)* *boh<sup>E</sup> syr pesh*  
*επι του χορτους sic* L (cf *εχ<sup>ω</sup> πεχορ<sup>ω</sup>τ<sup>ω</sup>τ<sup>ω</sup> sah*)

Whether "herbage" plural or "grass" singular is original cannot be determined. I incline to the reading of D, regarding the genitive after *επι* here as an "improvement" of **NB** *Origen*.

The foregoing is more important than it seems, for very close after occurs another case which I think illustrates the matter perfectly, and fixes the authorship of both changes as that of *Origen*.

- xiv. 25. *επι την θαλασσαν* **NBPT<sup>c</sup>WΔΘΦ** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 1 [*non* 118–209]  
*fam* 13 22 238 *Sod*<sup>al. aliq</sup> *Orig*  
*επι της θαλασσης* CD *rell Eus*<sup>bis</sup>

Observe this is a change in inverse ratio to the last. The genitive of rest—we can almost see *Origen* at work—belongs to *ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου* in ver 19, but the accusative of motion belongs to *ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν* in ver 25. *Tisch* emphasises our point for us by saying of *Origen* "praeterea notat: ου γεγραπται ἦλθε προς περιπατων επι τα κυματα, αλλ επι τα υδατα." Clearly then *Origen* employed the accusative after *επι* here as of motion on or over the waters, and the accusative must be an emendation for the poor fisherfolk's Greek genitive.

It is true that in the next verse 26 **NBCD**(T<sup>c</sup>) have *ιδοντες αυτον επι της θαλασσης περιπατουντα* and not *επι την θαλ. περιπ.* as the rest, but I doubt whether this affects my contention, as "they saw him on the sea . . walking." Besides it is a delicate point as to the exact case which *επι* should govern here.

My point seems well taken, because a little further on **N** gets an opportunity and avails of it (xvi. 19) to exhibit the difference between *δησης επι της γης*, which he leaves unchanged, and *λυσης επι της γης*, which latter he changes to *λυσης επι την γην*.

But these little things were done in passing, because at xviii. 18 *λυσητε επι της γης* (following *δησητε επι της γης*) is left unchanged by **N**.

Matt.

- xxv. 18. See p. 67. Nothing further occurs until
- xxvi. 7, where **NBDMΘ<sup>e</sup>** *fam* 1 (118 *hesitans*) *fam* 13 [*non* 124] 106 301 604 *et Eust<sup>decem</sup>* prefer *ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς* for *ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν* of the rest and *Basil.* In Mark xiv. 3 a partitive genitive is used *κατέχευεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς* (—*ἐπὶ*). Perhaps the Marcan diction influenced **NBD** in Matthew. The presence of ten Lectionaries and but few cursives lends some emphasis.
- xxvii. 43. *πεποιθεν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ* **B** 213 alone for *πεπ. ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ* with *latt<sup>v</sup>* [*non c d f g<sub>1</sub> vg<sup>D<sup>FR</sup></sup>*] with *Eus* 1/2 and *Juvencus*. Apart from possible Latin sympathy, it would seem to be the most delicate appreciation among Greeks of the alternative case to use after a certain shade of meaning of the verb. I class it here and under Latin, as well as under solecisms of **B**. Observe *Eus* is on both sides. Hort put *τῷ θεῷ* in his margin.

*Change of Number.*

- vi. 5. See under "Improvement."
28. *αὐξανουσιν* and *κοπιῶσιν* and *νηθουσιν* **NB** *Sod<sup>050</sup>* *fam* 1 4 33 273 *Sod<sup>178</sup>* *Ath copt et verss* for *αὐξάνει . . κοπία . . νήθει* (after *τα κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ*) of all the rest. *Soden txt* plural as well as *Hort*.
32. *ἐπιζητουσιν* (*pro ἐπιζητεῖ*) after *τα ἔθνη* **NB** *min pauc copt contra rell.* We have to assume that *all* others strove for improvement by writing the verb singular, or that **NB** thought it best to employ the plural. *Soden txt* plural like *Hort*.
- [xi. 23. *ἐμμεῖνεν* (*pro ἐμμεῖναν*) see under "Syriac."]
- xii. 4. (Improvement) *ἐφαγον* for *ἐφάγεν* **NB** *o<sup>scr</sup>*. *W-H* not *Sod*. This follows *εἰσῆλθεν*, but is accommodated to the previous verse 3 *οὐκ ἀνεγνώτε τι ἐποίησε Δᾶδ ὅτι ἐπεινάσεν (αὐτός) καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ*. Obs. here that the coptics oppose **NB** and have *ἐφάγεν*.
- xiii. 5. *ἐξανετεῖλαν* (*pro ἐξανετεῖλεν*) **B** only with *vg* and *some latins* "exorta sunt" (and *k fructicaverunt*) and coptic.
16. *ἀκουουσιν* (*pro ἀκουεῖ*) following *ῶτα* (to accord with *βλεπουσιν*, following however *οφθαλμοί*) **NBCDMXΣ** *al Orig latt contra unc<sup>11</sup> al. pl.*
- [xvii. 2. **L** (and **HUF**) change *ἐγενετο* following *ἰματῖα αὐτοῦ* to *ἐγενοντο*. Not so **D<sup>sr</sup>** (although *d* is *facta sunt*) nor **B rell.** It is mentioned to show the *tendency* as represented by **L**.]
- xvii. 4. See under "Improvement."
- xxv. 32. *συναχθησονται* (*pro συναχθησεται*) as to *παντα τα ἔθνη* **NBDGKLUII** *al.*
- xxvi. 31. *διασκορπισθησονται* (*pro -σεται*) as to *τα προβάτα* **NABCGH\*ILM** *al. copt Orig* 1/2
- xxvii. 52. *ηγερθησαν* (*pro ηγερθη*) as to *πολλα σωματα* by **NBDGL** [*non W*] *min perpauc copt Orig Eus* (*ἀνεστήσαν Cyr*) seems clearly Egyptian.



[The singular verb after neuter pl. is not unusual in N.T. Greek. Cf Matt xiii. 4 *κατεφαγεν* all as to *τα πετεινα*, although some have *ηλθον*. The Latins and *d* all *venerunt* and *comederunt* incl. *d* agst D<sup>gr</sup> *ηλθον* . . *κατεφαγεν*. The cases mentioned above trace to the "version influence" and predominantly to the coptic, which favours the plural after these neuters. But observe that W avoids all this.]

The point here raised seems to me to be of a good deal of importance and quite interesting. At first sight the narrow view may be that these few Egyptian mss, representing as Hort might have said "the watchful scholars of Alexandria," are preserving "the true text" with their plural verbs, and that "Antioch," in a purist mood, changed them to the singular after the neuter plurals. To do this "Antioch" would have had to forget the versions ringing in its ears, and have outdone Alexandria in an affectation of purism in its Greek. Since the Egyptian practice however, as represented by the Copts, is to employ the verb in the plural number in such cases, it is more likely that these few Egyptian mss (plus some others in certain of the cases) displaced the singular in the Greek from an innate habit in such cases. It would not merit so much attention if we did not find these mss habitually revising throughout. But as we do, and as we shall prove this in these pages, I consider the probabilities are that the singular number employed by the "traditional" text is the correct base and was modified in Egypt, owing to the "version tradition." The cases at vi. 28, 32 and xiii. 5 (B alone) are to be considered more especially in this connection.

### Change of Order.

Matt.

- vi. 33. > *και την δικαιοσυνην και την βασιλειαν αυτου* B alone
- xi. 9. > *προφητην ιδειν* for *ιδειν · προφητην*; **N**\*BZW 892 *Sod*<sup>1246</sup> *Orig*  
 26. > *ευδοκια εγενετο* **NBW** *Sod*<sup>950</sup> 1 33 892 *k* (*copt*) *Sod txt*
- xii. 44. > *εις τον οικον μου επιστρεψω* **NBDZ** 7 33 892 *aeth* against  
*rell* and all other versions. *Sod txt* follows **NB**.
- xiii. 39. > *ο δε εχθρος εστιν ο σπειρας αυτα ο διαβολος* B alone  
*εστιν* alone occupies this position in B. He may have  
 hesitated as to omission of *αυτα*, or of *εχθρος* as some.
- xiv. 18. > *φερετε μοι ωδε αυτους* (*pro* *φερετε μοι αυτους ωδε*) **NBZ**  
 33 *vg*<sup>D</sup> only. This is a small matter but an almost impossible  
 order, and against *sah* and (*boh*). *ωδε* is omitted (and the  
 "neutral" text *me judice* is without it) by D *d* 1 *boh aliq*  
*syr cu sin it*<sup>pl</sup> [the vulgates vary the order tremendously]  
*vg*<sup>X\*</sup>. No doubt it was added in the margin of the parents  
 of **NBZ** and found its way into the wrong place in the  
 text. *Soden* however follows *Hort* and **NBZ**.

Matt.

- xvi. 21. > *οτι δει αυτον εις Ιεροσολυμα απελθειν* **NBD**<sup>sr</sup> 1 *fam* 13 33 157 *y*<sup>scr</sup> *e Orig Iren*<sup>int</sup> *Hil* (for *οτι δει αυτον απελθειν εις Ιεροσ.*). The change savours of improvement but *Soden* likes and adopts it.
- xvii. 4. > *σκηνας τρεις* **B** *e* (cf *Luc ix. 33*) *W-H marg.*
- xix. 16. > *προσελθων αυτω ειπεν* (*pro προσελθων ειπεν αυτω*) **NB** *Sod*<sup>oso</sup> *fam* 13 157 892 *Sod*<sup>190 1333</sup> (*et txt*) *e f sah arm aeth Chr Auct*<sup>op imp</sup> (*Just*) against the rest and *syr*. This involves a change in the sense. *Boh* and Old Latins *a b c g h q* complete with *προσελθων αυτω ειπεν αυτω*.

It is rather indeterminate, for while *Justin*<sup>apol</sup> says *προσελθοντος αυτω τινος και ειποντος*, in *Trypho* he says *λεγοντος αυτω τινος* (*Clem*<sup>hom</sup> and *Marcos*<sup>Iren</sup> are indeterminate).

- xxii. 28. > *εν τη αναστασει ουν* **NBDL** *fam* 1 *fam* 13 2<sup>pe</sup> (*Sod*) 604 *Sod*<sup>tres</sup> *boh syr* (*om ουν syr sin*) for *εν τη ουν αναστασει* of nearly all other Greeks and *sah*. *Soden* follows *Hort* and **NBDL**.

It seems to be a sheer improvement. *D* joins probably because *d* had it with the other Latins, who had already changed the order when translating, as *syr pesh* (but *syr sin* omits). What reason on earth could there be for poor "Antioch" to change to *εν τη ουν αναστασει*?

40. (involving change of number) A most important place : *εν ταυταις ταις δυσιν εντολαις ολος* (*om N syr diatess copt*) *ο νομος* > *κρεμαται και οι προφηται* **NBDLZΣ** 33 892 (*pro εν ταυτ. τ. δυσιν εντ. ολος ο νομος* > *και οι προφηται κρεμανται* **WΦ** *unc*<sup>13</sup> *rell min et fam* 1 13 604 2<sup>pe</sup> *omn*)

The change is very old but still looks like "improvement." With **NBDLZΣ** 33 892 are ranged the Latins including *Tert*<sup>Jejun</sup> with *syr* [but *diatess*<sup>int</sup> "are hung the law and the prophets," as *aeth*<sup>int</sup> "pendent tota lex et prophetae"; notice the order], while for **WΦ** and the mass, including all the important cursives (but 33 892) are to be added *sah boh* very distinctly—*sah*: "The law and the prophets are hanging on these two commandments," *boh*: "On these commandments two the law with the prophets were hung"—together with *Clem*<sup>bis</sup> (*εν τουτω ολος ο νομος και οι προφηται κρεμανται*, and: *εν ταυταις λεγει ταις εντολαις ολον τον νομον και τους προφητας κρεμασθαι τε και εξηρητησθαι*), also *Orig*<sup>int</sup> 1/5 and *Orig*<sup>3.981</sup>. *Basil* is on both sides. Thus it is by no means certain that **NB** are right. Their great allies the *sah* and *boh* desert them,† and I prefer the harder reading of **W**. (*Soden txt* follows *Hort* and **NB** etc.)

- xxiv. 44. > *η ου δοκειτε ωρα* (*pro η ωρα ου δοκειτε*) **NBDI** 604 892 *d vg boh Ath contra rell*

It is a little suspicious for *Ath* joins, and **L** says *η ωρα η ου δοκειτε*, not going with **NB**, but *Sod* follows *Hort* and **NBDI**.

† Plainly then neither *sah* nor *boh* used **N** or **B**.

Matt.

xxvi. 36. > *εκει προσευξωμαι* (*pro προσευξ. εκει*) NBDL fam 69 [non 124]† 33 157 892 Sod<sup>96</sup> et txt a b c d f ff<sub>2</sub> h q r sah boh Orig<sup>int</sup> (ff<sub>1</sub> g<sub>1.2</sub> aeth illuc et orem). This is a place where with a good many others (not noticed) *copt* and *lat* together support NB. Read *εκει ευξομαι* 604 [non — ; *corrigé ed.*] after the Egyptian form.

Thus at xxvi. 39 *προελθων* (for *προσελθων*) BMH\* are supported by Latin "progressus" (*d* only *accedens*) and *sah boh* very distinctly also support *προελθων*.

### Historic Present.

"It will be seen in the following lists that the 'historic present' is very frequent in Mark's narrative, comparatively rare in Matthew's, and extremely rare in Luke's. . . . Now if (as we see was probably the case in other matters) Matthew and Luke made this change of phraseology from Mark, they were only preferring a more usual to a less usual mode of expression. For it appears from the LXX that the employment of the historic present had been up to this time by no means common with the writers of the sacred story in the *Koinḗ* or Hellenistic Greek. . . . And Dr. J. H. Moulton says that it is common in the papyri." ('*Horæ Synopticæ*,' Hawkins, pp. 143/4.)

It follows from this that St. Matthew and St. Luke changed the historic present of St. Mark's source if that source was a written one and the one from which they drew. Or that they found in their "Q" few historic presents, or if they found them that they changed them.†

Then, later, the papyri show us, and Alexandrian second and third century writers bear this out, that the historic present, and especially the imperfect, came into vogue. Hence the changes in this direction found in N and B in Matthew, Luke and John (*cf. Matt* xiv. 19 *κελευει* Orig 2/3).

If one consults Tischendorf at Apoc. xii. 13 as to *εδιωξεν*, we read in his note: "N<sup>c</sup> *εξεδιωξεν* (N\* *corrupte* *εδωκεν*)." But it is nothing of the sort. *εδωκεν* is *corrupte* for *εδιωκεν*. I found this confirmed by the full commentary of Oecumenius in Apoc 146 (Messina<sup>99</sup>) where the imperfect stands in his text and is repeated three times over in his commentary. *Gigas*' latin also gives the imperfect. I mention this in an introductory manner, because the text of Oecumenius' MS of the Apoc. is thoroughly Alexandrian and unites the base of N and A, and this (unpublished) passage gives us a true picture of Alexandrian usage. See my article on *Oecumenius* in American Journ. of Philology, Oct. 1913.

† *Hiat* 13; *προσευξωμαι* κακει 124. *Om εκει* 4. 2<sup>o</sup> arm syr.

† This "Q" business seems to me to lack a proper foundation. St. Luke's language is so utterly his own that he could hardly have used any other written source than notes prepared for his own use. Consult Dr. Hobart's work on the 'Medical Language of St. Luke,' Dublin, 1882. Every page of St. Luke's Gospel is saturated with his own way of expressing matters, now expanding, now contracting the narrative, but ever with a method, a manner and a diction which are personal.

Matt.

- xiii. 28. λεγουσιν (*pro ειπον*) **NBCD** 33 (*Sod*) 157 892 *Sod*<sup>h</sup> 1341  
*latt pl* (against *rell* and *f ff<sub>1</sub> q sah boh arm aeth*)

How come **NB** to desert coptic here? The authorities do not agree about this verse, for **B** drops the *δουλοι* so as to make a pair *ο δε εφη αυτοις . . οι δε λεγουσιν αυτω*, and **BC** write *αυτω λεγουσιν* while **ND** *λεγουσιν αυτω*; and *εφη* at the beginning is changed to the present by the Latins *ait*. Cf the next verse *φησιν* or *λεγει* **NBC latt** (all varying among themselves) against *εφη* and *ειπεν* of the majority. Cf also long quotation from *Epiph<sup>manich</sup>* in Tisch. showing some interesting variations. (*- αυτω Sod*<sup>1094</sup> *cum pers*).

- xiii. 52. λεγει (*pro ειπεν*) **B\*\*D** 892 *Sod*<sup>1353 1444</sup> *vg it*

But this is more than a historic present (*λεγουσιν αυτω ναι . λεγει αυτοις . .*) to conform to the *λεγουσιν* preceding, for it shows that when *λεγει* follows *λεγουσιν* thus, **B<sup>cor</sup>** does not object as the historic present is maintained, while elsewhere to avoid tautology (see under "Improvement" Matt. xii. 48, Luke ix. 21) *λεγοντι* is substituted for *ειποντι* following *ειπεν*.

We shall see much more later on of the historic imperfect favoured by the Alexandrian school and **B**. An illustration offers at Matt. ix. 9 of **N** (who also elsewhere prefers this) deliberately siding with **D** 21 892 *d* alone of all authorities (+ *Sod*<sup>tr<sup>s</sup></sup> *et Sod txt*!) for *ηκολουθει* here instead of *ηκολουθησεν*, which should be noted, as it opposes all other Greeks, and all Latins (but *d*) and both coptics.

In the very next verse but one (ix. 11) **NBCLW** 892 *al<sup>allq</sup>* prefer *ελεγον* with many latins to *ειπον* against the rest and *d k copt*. *Soden txt* does not adopt *ελεγον* although his *same* new MSS as in ix. 9 do so. Again ix. 19. *ηκολουθει* **NCD** 33 *Sod*<sup>tr<sup>s</sup></sup> (*non txt*) *latt<sup>pl</sup>*; *ηκολουθησεν* **B** *rell copt f k*

23. They prefer this historic imp. even above the historic present, having here *ελεγεν* **NBD** 892 *it<sup>pl</sup> boh*, against *dixit c g<sub>1</sub> h k sah syr Sod*<sup>1443</sup> *ειπεν*, and *λεγει CW unc<sup>10</sup> gr mult*

The same applies to ix. 30 where **NB\*** *fam* 1 22 892 (those faithful adherents, see at vi. 5, 18) *Sod*<sup>178</sup> *et txt* prefer *ενεβριμηθη* to *ενεβριμησατο* of all the rest and versions (but *comminabatur* by *aeth<sup>int</sup> Walton*).

- xv. 25. *προσεκυνει* (*pro προσεκυνησεν*) **N\*BDM** 1 *fam* 13 33 *al. txt*  
*rec Orig b c d ff<sub>1</sub> g<sub>1,2</sub> k boh<sup>unus</sup> (sah adorans)*

This is against all other uncials and **W** for *προσεκυνησεν* including *boh*. (At xv. 31 **B** has *εδοξασαν* with most, but **NL** *min*<sup>40</sup> and *Latin* have *εδοξαζον*. I mention it because *k\** not content with *clarificabant* actually has *clarificant*.)

- xv. 36. *εδιδου* (*pro εδωκεν*) **NBD** 1 *fam* 13 33 157 892 *d Chr Thdor*<sup>mops schol</sup>

This against the other Greeks, all other Latins and versions. Why should the "Antioch" revision have constantly cancelled the historic imperfect? Far more likely that **NB** made the changes. A scholion is always a dangerous adherent for them, as here. We would surely

find a trace of *dabat* in *a* or *e* or *k* if legitimate. This remark is the more apposite because immediately afterwards at xv. 37 B alone with D and nearly all Latins has an important change of order which is clearly influenced by the Latin. (εδιδου xv. 36, *Sod*<sup>1353</sup> only new witness, but also *Sod txt*).

Matt.

xvii. 20. ο δε λεγει (*pro* ο δε ειπεν) **NBD** 1 *fam* 13 33 *it*<sup>vi</sup> *syr et Sod txt contra C rell gr et a f g<sub>2</sub> n q copt*.

xviii. 25. εχει (*pro* ειχεν) Not content here with ειχεν and *habebat* of all Latins, B with only *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 1 56 58 124 *Sod*<sup>1341</sup> *Orig* 1/2 makes a deliberate change to the present.

xix. 21. λεγει (*pro* εφη) B *Sod*<sup>050</sup> and *fam* 13 only of Greeks, with *latt*.

xxi. 13. This is a very important place (following xxi. 1/12 where the synoptic influences are all at work). **NBL** 124 [*contra fam*] 892 with *boh aeth*<sup>vid</sup> *Orig* 2/4 and *Eus* (and only these + *Sod*<sup>tr:28</sup>) read ποιειτε, making an historic present of it, "but ye make it a den of thieves." 604 avoids it and against it are the mass including DW with *εποιησατε* as *Basil* (and St. Luke), and 1 *Justin Orig* 2/4 *πεποιηκατε* (as St. Mark) and as *latt* "fecistis" with *sah arm* and *Iren*<sup>int</sup>. But *Soden txt* prints ποιειτε.

Now the reason for the change by *Orig* 2/4 and *Eus* with *boh aeth* and only **NBL** 124 892 to ποιειτε appears most subtle. It would make three various readings in Matt. Mark and Luke instead of two (= one, because aorist = perfect). In *Jeremiah* vii. 11 no verb is used, the verb appearing in verse 10. Thus 10 *fin*: το μη ποιειν παντα τα βδελ. ταυτα continuing (11) μη σπηλαιων ληστων, so that, as "το μη ποιειν" is used, there seemed liberty here in Alexandria to employ the favorite historic present.

xxi. 43. Observe a place emphasising the historic present [which here stands unchanged by all] for after δια τουτο λεγω υμιν **NB** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 28 64 118-209 243 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 892 *Sod*<sup>178 541</sup> *Evs*<sup>ta septem</sup> with *Arnob* omit *στι*. Here *boh sah* [except *boh*<sup>re</sup>] retain the usual introductory *χε*, as also *syr* and *lat*. This matter is omitted in *Tisch N.T.*, but supplied in 'Emendanda.'

NOTE.—I dare not extend this essay to cover peculiarities of *other* mss. Yet note that the historic present is favoured by L alone even when the others do not use it, e.g. xxii. 4 αποσπελλει *pro* απεσπειλεν L only, although leaving απεσπειλεν in ver 3 [*Iren* vers 3 "et mittenti"; *Hil.* ver 4 "qui vero iterum cum praeceptorum conditione mittuntur"]. L of course is close to the "family" **NB**, and observe soon after that L *Orig Iren*<sup>int</sup> are alone in omitting αυτου at xxii. 6, so that the text is "old" enough for αποσπελλει in ver 4 to attract attention. *Origen*, as I have said before, is no fair representative of any pure text, for hereabouts he goes jumping about in his preferences, using ανειλεν at xxii. 7 (and deliberately, for he repeats αναιρουσι [observe the tense] soon after) with *fam* 1 22 against απωλεσεν of **NB** *rell*. Again, ver 8 he omits εστιν with *Chr Dam* and ΔΣ only and *Sod*<sup>3017</sup>.

I may also call attention to the use by **N** alone at xxvi. 21 of λέγει for εἶπεν of our Lord's opening speech at the last supper.

And as bearing on the freedom with which such matters were handled in the time of *Tatian*, we notice that when quoting St. John i. 5 (*contra Graecos*) instead of saying καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν, *Tatian* says: καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον· ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει.

Next we will consider Harmonistic Readings, and finally General Improvement.

### *Harmonistic Omissions.*

**Matt.**

xx. 16. The final clause πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσι κλητοὶ ὁλογοὶ δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ is removed by **NBLZ** 36 892 *sah boh* (some *aeth* mss, not Walton), but only by these, as being an importation from xxii. 14. But *Orig<sup>bis</sup>* witnesses for it at this place (besides thrice at xxii. 14). The Latins are a unit with all the Syriacs (both *cu* and *sin* being extant here at xx. 16) for the clause, not even *e* or *ff* or *r*<sub>2</sub> joining what I must regard only as an "Egyptian" conspiracy, and so I enter this also under "Coptic." It is not a question, I am sure, of the coptics sharing an underlying text of **NBLZ**, for **D** is against them and **W** and all the rest, nor do the sympathising cursives join **NB**, not even 33, which here keeps with its great friend Origen. Here then our XIX century restoration did not give us even Origen's Greek Testament, and Hort accuses him *e silentio* of having failed to report the "shorter" text here. But Hort had doubts, for he puts the disputed clause in the margin. Not so *Soden*, who simply excludes (with <sup>371 1443</sup> φ<sup>a</sup>).

A light is thrown on the proceeding (but we do not observe these things contextually as we should) for at the beginning of the next verse **B** and 1 alone of Gks, with *SAH BOH* and *Orig* (only 2/3), write μελλων δε αναβαινειν for και αναβαινων against **N** and the rest. Thus if the text were basic in xx. 16 *fin* for the "non-interpolation," why should **N** desert **B** here? It must be *because* **B** was following *sah*.

Again (same verse xx. 17) τοὺς δωδεκα (—μαθητας) is read by **NLZ** and **D** 1 892 with *boh*, but *sah* joins **B** in writing τοὺς δωδεκα μαθητας (+αυτου *sah* 1/2), so that *sah* and **B** are very close here. As to an underlying text, it is **N** (or *syr cu sin* τοὺς δωδεκα αυτου) which preserve it, for *Orig* (*quater*) goes with **N** against **B** here. Besides **N** gives us the *syr* base in the next verse xx. 18 εἰς θανατον with *boh<sup>pl</sup> pers* for εν θανατω (which **B** *aeth* omit).

xxii. 30. — του θεου **BD fam** 1 and all *latt vett* (but *ff*<sub>1</sub> *g*<sub>1.2</sub> *l*) *syr cu sin sah arm* and *Orig*, but probably because of Mark xii. 25.

xxiii. 38. — ερημος *fin*. Only **BL ff**<sub>2</sub> *syr S boh* (some) and *sah* 3/4. The group clearly belongs together, except perhaps *syr S*. Origen opposes (except *Orig<sup>ms</sup> semel*) and *Clem arm aeth Eus Cyr*

Matt.

*Iren*<sup>int</sup> *Cypr* have it. What is this but a harmonistic "shorter" text based on the omission in Luke (xiii. 35)? Many add *ερημος* in Luke, but there it would seem that the evidence for the "shorter text" is "overwhelming." *Soden* does not adduce a single new witness for omission in Matthew.

### Harmonistic Additions.

- vi. 22. +σου (*post οφθαλμος prim.*) B 372 *it*<sup>pl</sup> *vg*<sup>16</sup> *aeth Orig*<sup>int</sup> *ex Luc xi. 34* against **N** and the rest.
- viii. 9. +τασσομενος (*post ειμι υπο εξουσιαν*) **NB** 4 238 273 372 421 *q*<sup>scr</sup> (observe the extraordinary comment these six utterly diverse cursives offer on the situation, for it is not *fam* 1 or *fam* 13 or even 22 or 28, still less 157 or 33 or 892, which add with **NB**; such a point is quite lost by *Soden* who neglects the cursives previously reported, naming only 273 372) *boh (sah) latt multi Chr (semel !)*, against all the rest; comes from Luke vii. 8. (The excuse for the Latin [but *f ff*<sub>1</sub> *l vgg*<sup>pl</sup> *Hier* and some others do not add] is that the Latin *sub potestate* is rather bare without the addition of *constitutus*.)
- xv. 38. +ως (*ante τετρακισχιλοι*) B (**N**) *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 1 *fam* 13 22 33 157 *Sod*<sup>pauc</sup> *ff*<sub>1</sub> (*sah*) *arm aeth (ex Marc viii. 9)* *Sod* outdoes *W-H (marg)* adding *txt* outright.

**N** seems to have been perplexed, for he and *boh* only omit in Mark, while in Matthew he has a change of order alone where he adds [and *Tisch* neglects to accept his witness there by error].

- xxiv. 36. +ουδε ο υιος **N**<sup>\*et</sup> *cbBDΦ* 13-124 28 86 *Sod*<sup>quattuor</sup> *aeth arm it*<sup>pl</sup> *syrr hier [non sin pesh]*

This must come from Mark xiii. 32 where practically all have it. I do not wish to discuss this as it borders on another province of criticism, merely pointing out that **NB** on occasion can add (when it suits them) as well as omit. May I ask why other authorities "omit" here in Matthew while retaining in Mark?

The O.L. here is very closely related to the *Diatess* which quotes from Mark xiii. 32, beginning a new paragraph at § xlii. 32 and running Mark xiii. 32/37 straight on.

### Harmonistic Changes.

Matt.

- x. 13. See under "Improvement."
- xiv. 5. *επει* (*pro οτι*) B alone with 604 (*επειδη NΣ7*) *Cf.* xxi. 46 for the parallel under consideration.
- xvi. 20. *επετιμησεν* B\*D *W-H*<sup>txt</sup> *d e syrr cu* against the rest and *Orig*<sup>quater</sup> (*ex Marc et Luc*). *Soden* adduces no new witnesses and excludes.
- xviii. 6. (improvement) *περι του τραχηλου* only **NBLZΣ7** 28 157 *y*<sup>scr</sup> *Sod*<sup>septem</sup> [*non txt*] *Orig* 1/2 *Bas Cyr* (= *Marc ix. 42, Luc xvii. 2*). The Latins here (even *e*) in *Matt* have *in* (against *circa* Mark,

Luke) with most Greeks including 1 13 22 *Orig* 1/2, while only DU *d* have *ἐπι*.

*Orig* 1/2 is exceedingly suspicious, and why should *περι* be changed if original?

**Matt.**  
xix. 24. *τρηματος* **N\*B** *Orig* 1/3 (*Orig* 1/3 *τρυμαλιας cum plur*,  
*Orig* 1/3 *τρυπης*)

**Mark**  
x. 25. *τρηματος* **N\*** *sol* (*Rell* *τρυμαλιας et B†*; *al.* *τρυπηματος*)

**Luke**  
xviii. 25. *τρηματος* **NBD** 49 (*τρυπηματος* LR 157 *ραυς*, *τρυμαλιας plur*)

Thus **N** is the only one who did not get tired of turning his pages backward and forward and who is consistent throughout.

(*Clem*, like *Orig*, varies: *δια της τρυμαλιας της βελ.*, *δια τρηματος ραφιδος*, *δια τρυπηματος βελ.*, and fourthly simply *δια βελονης*.)

This is a place where we must call in outside assistance to settle a textual difficulty, and the matter appears quite simple.

St. Matthew doubtless wrote *δια τρυπηματος ραφιδος*,

St. Mark                   ,,           ,, *δια (της) τρυμαλιας (της) ραφιδος*,

St. Luke                   ,,           ,, *δια τρηματος βελονης*.

We find **NB** changing St. Matthew's *τρυπηματος* to St. Luke's *τρηματος*, but retaining St. Matthew's *ραφιδος*. We find **N** changing St. Mark's *τρυμαλιας* to St. Luke's *τρηματος*, while retaining the *ραφιδος* belonging jointly to St. Matthew and St. Mark, which however *fam* 13 changes to *βελονης* in Mark, as rudely *Clem*, who mixes up the passages.

Then we find that while **NBD** give us correctly *τρηματος βελονης* in St. Luke, the *others* harmonise there by writing, incorrectly, *τρυπηματος* of Matthew or *τρυμαλιας* of Mark, and many *ραφιδος* for *βελονης*.

I say "incorrectly" because the wording *δια τρηματος βελονης* harmonises so beautifully with other medical diction of St. Luke that it is hardly possible to challenge the reading of **NBD**(L) here. I quote from Dr. Hobart, 'Medical Language of St. Luke,' Dublin 1882, p. 60: "The words used by St. Luke are those which a medical man would naturally employ, for *βελόνη* was the surgical needle, and *τρήμα* the great medical word for a perforation of any kind. But still further, we meet with the same expression in *Galen*: *ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὅτι ῥάμμα τοῦ διατρήματος τῆς βελόνης διηρημένου ἔνεκα τοῦ συνάγειν ἀλλήλοις ἦτοι τὰ μόρια τοῦ διατετμημένου σώματος*. And to express the puncture made by the needle: *διὰ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν βελόνην τρήματος*. *Τρήμα*, peculiar to St. Luke, in medical language was applied to all perforations in the body, e.g. in the ears, nostrils, vertebrae, the sockets of the teeth, &c." Dr. Hobart adds seventeen other quotations from *Hippocrates* and *Galen* illustrating this.

The question thus seems very simple and reduces itself to the fact that **N** harmonised all three passages by employing St. Luke's *τρήματος*



everywhere, that B did this in Matthew but not in Mark, while the others, who correctly report Matthew and Mark, go wrong in Luke and harmonise wrongly there to Mark's *τρυμαλιας* or Matthew's *τρυπηματος*, the matter being self-evident by their employ of *ραφιδος* instead of *βελουης* in Luke.

Matt.

- xx. 17. For *και αναβαινων* B says *μελλων δε αναβαινειν*. B is supported by 1 [*non fam*] *sah boh syr pesh pers* and *Orig* 2/3, but it seems a clear reflection of Mark x. 32 (whence the *diatessaron* draws) "*ησαν δε εν τη οδω αναβαινοντες εις Ιεροσολυμα.*" I place this here and not under "Coptic," but a glance under "Coptic" will show that at xx. 8, 16, 34 there is an Egyptian conspiracy involving B in the four places, including xx. 17, so close and careful as to reveal B and coptic as editors, and not as neutrals.

Just so  $\aleph + min^3$  exhibits the process on its side at xx. 24 by writing *ηξαντο αγανακτηειν* with Mark (x. 41 [the *diatess* § xxxi. opens with the account from Mark x. 41/44]) instead of *ηγανακτησαν*. And if we look beyond to xxii. 40 we find *-ολος* by  $\aleph$  alone is the way of the *diatessaron* with all the syriacs and *sah boh<sup>pl</sup>*; so that coptic is in sympathy here too.

- xxi. 2. *κατεναντι* (*pro απεναντι*)  $\aleph$ BCDLZ $\Phi$  892 *al*<sup>10</sup> *Orig* 1/2 *Eus* 1/2 borrowing from Mark xi. 2, Luke xix. 30 where *κατεναντι* stands by all. (See under "Synonyms.")
7. *επ αυτων* (*primo loco*)  $\aleph$ BDLZ $\Phi$  33 69 892\* *Sod*<sup>duo</sup> *Orig*<sup>bis</sup> (against *επανω αυτων* of all the rest)

This seems to be merely a reflection of Mark xi. 7 *επ αυτον* and Luke xix. 35 *επι τον πωλον*.

*Tisch* forgets to say that the rest of the 13 family omit the preposition altogether and write *ατω*.

- xxi. 12. *-του θεου* (*cf Marc* xi. 15 *Luc* xix. 45) See under "Coptic" and beyond under "Improvement."

25. *εν εαυτοις* (*pro παρ εαυτοις*) BLM<sup>2</sup>Z 157 372 892 *min*<sup>6</sup> (*copt*) *Cyr*. This seems merely a "nicety" of harmony to Matt. xvi. 7 and 8 where *εν εαυτοις* is used on both occasions without fluctuation among MSS. Why then should "Antioch" change at xxi. 25 to *παρ εαυτοις*? What reason would there be?

- xxii. 39. *δευτερα* (*-δε*)  $\aleph$ B 4 157 *Sod*<sup>243</sup> only (against the versions and *sah boh pl*) with *sah*<sup>111</sup> *boh*<sup>C17K2\*</sup> comes from Mark xii. 31 "*δευτερα αυτη.*" Observe that B improvises (alone) in Matthew by substituting *ομοιως* for *ομοια αυτη*.

- xxvii. 29. *περιεθηκαν* B 131. *cf Marc* xv. 17 *περιτιθεασιν*.
33. *εις τον τοπον του* B<sup>801</sup> *cf Luc* xxiii. 33 exactly.

Here is harmony in full blast in this "neutral" text. Consult in the same verse 33 *-λεγομενον* by  $\aleph$  alone (*= Marc* xv. 22) and the

picture is complete as to *both* **N** and B harmonising in exactly the place where they should be most careful not to do so if they expect our confidence elsewhere.

[I would call attention to xxvii. 35 without any emphasis because the reading in the photographic edition of B cannot be determined. No mention of it is made in Tischendorf's notes, but in Gregory's *Emendanda* attention is directed to B\* *διεμερισαν* for *διεμερισαντο*. In the photograph it reads ΔΙΕΜΕΡΙCΑ<sup>TO</sup> with a very small *to* which was perhaps added by an early corrector. In the LXX as in B's own text of Ps. xxii. the reading is *διεμερισαντο*. If *διεμερισαν* B\* be correct we have an elimination of *sibi* after *diviserunt* with *c f ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>1,2</sub> r r<sub>2</sub> Aug<sup>Joh</sup>* and *vg omn (exceptis BQX Cerne dimma)*† and *syr*, but *sah boh* are explicit "among them." In Mark xv. 24 the expression is *διαμεριζονται τα ιματια αυτου*, but in Luke xxiii. 34 (where B had just been looking; see above as to *εις τον τοπον του*) it is *διαμεριζομενοι δε τα ιματια*, without any reflexive attribute. In Jo. xix. 24 the quotation shows *διεμερισαντο*, while in verse 23 the procedure is carefully explained, involving the middle voice, for it is said of the soldiers *ελαβον τα ιματια αυτου και εποησαν τεσσαρα μερη εκαστω στρατιωτη μέρος, και τον χιτωνα.*]

Matt.

xxvii. 46. *εβησηεν* BLWΣ 33 69-124 218 604 *Sod*<sup>ano</sup> only as Mark xv. 34. All others with **N** and *Eus Bas ανεβησηεν* and *a d ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>2</sub> h vg<sup>H</sup> and R (boh)* exclamavit.

*ibid.* *ελωει ελωει* B (and *sah*) with *ελωι ελωι* **N** 33 (and *boh*) seem distinctly to favour the Marcan form. Observe that *syr* differentiates between the words used in St. Matt. and St. Mark as do most Greeks, whereas **NB** alone, as usual, obscure the issue. Yet Hort found absolutely nothing "Alexandrian" or "Egyptian" in codex B. Here, absolutely alone, it is with *sah* in a particular form. He abandons the spelling of B here for that of **N**, although he was glad enough to seize *εβησηεν* of B in the same verse against **N**. The Revisers recognise the harmony, and go back to *ανεβησηεν* and *Ηλι Ηλι*, but the evidence in Souter's footnote is wrongly stated.

### General Improvement.

ii. 22. *βασιλευει της Ιουδαιας (- επι)* **NB** 892 *min pauc arm Eus. Contra rell et it et sah* ο *π̄ρρο* *εχ̄η* *†ιοτταλια* *sed boh plane* *χε* *αρ̄χελαος* *ετοι* *π̄οτρο* *ε†ιοτταεα* = **NB**. **NB** *ex boh, vel boh ex NB??* (*Soden* follows **NB**.)

† In the quotation itself, omitted by most Greeks and *d f ff<sub>1,2</sub> g<sub>1</sub> l vgg<sup>15+</sup>*, *sibi* is found in *a b c g<sub>2</sub> h q r<sub>2</sub> (mut r) vgg*, but omitted by two vulgates<sup>M<sup>O</sup></sup>.

The answer seems given in this same verse where **NBC\*W** alone change the order of *ηρωδου του πατρος αυτου* of all AND *sah boh* to *του πατρος αυτου ηρωδου*. (*Sod* does not follow, recognising synoptic influence.) Had *sah* or *boh* been copying **NB** they might have used this order.

v. 10. *ενεκα δικαιοσυνης* (*pro ενεκεν δικ.*) **B solus**. This is as clear as can be, preferring *ενεκα* before a consonant, besides being largely Homeric and classical. Cf *λογου ενεκα* "dicis causa," or *τεχνης ενεκα* (*Anth*). But **B** repeats *ενεκα* next verse before *μου*. [**N** does not join **B**. *Soden* forgets to record **B**.]

Observe, however, that **B** leaves *ενεκεν μου* alone before a vowel at x. 18, 39, xvi. 25, Mark viii. 35, x. 29 *primo loco*, Luke ix. 24, but alone makes it *ενεκα μου* at Mark xiii. 9.

At Matt. xix. 29 it is **N** which objects to *ενεκεν του μου*. **N**, with **D** and *Cyr*, writes *ενεκα του μου*, while **B** here remains with the rest. If **B** changes in one place and **N** in another we may be perfectly sure that it is editorial.

At Mark x. 29 *ενεκεν του ευαγγελιου* is now left alone by **NB** *reil*, and only changed here to *ενεκα του ευαγγ.* by **D** 71 and as *Tisch.* says "*catt<sup>com</sup>*" (a few omit the clause). At Luke xxi. 12 all *ενεκεν του ονοματος* except **D** 71 who are for *ενεκα του ονομ.*

At Luke vi. 22 all are agreed as to *ενεκα του υιου* except inconsistent **D** who with **F<sup>w</sup>PWΓ** writes *ενεκεν του υιου*, reversing his position.

At Luke xviii. 29 **NB** with *Sod*<sup>8 371</sup> prefer *εινεκεν της βασιλειας* (*ενεκεν της βασ.* the rest, except **U** 71 which here desire *ενεκα*).

At Matt. xix. 5 **NBLZ** *Orig* change *ενεκεν τουτου* to *ενεκα τουτου*. It seems quite clear that Matthew wrote *ενεκεν* throughout his Gospel.

At Mark x. 7 *ενεκεν τουτου* is left unchanged by all.

At Luke iv. 18 *εινεκεν εγχρισεν* or *ενεκεν εγχρισεν* are found.

I am far from saying that **N<sup>scribe</sup>** or **B<sup>scribe</sup>** or even **D<sup>scribe</sup>** made the changes, but their texts at some time in Egypt when in papyrus book form were no doubt tampered with in order to try and make the matter smooth.

Outside the Gospels we find Acts xix. 32 *ενεκεν συνεληλυθειςαν* most, but *ενεκα συνελ.* **NAB** and four cursives; xxvi. 21 *ενεκα τουτων* apparently all; xxviii. 20 *ενεκεν γαρ της ελπιδος* all but **N\*A** which write *εινεκεν* here; Rom. xiv. 20 *μη ενεκεν βρωματος* all; 2 Cor. iii. 10 *ενεκεν της υπερβαλλ. δοξης* most and many Fathers, but *εινεκεν της υπ. δοξ.* by **NABDEF\*\*GP**; 2 Cor. vii. 12 *ενεκεν ter* with infinitive by most including **NB**, only *εινεκεν* **E** and **L** (*primo loco*) *Thdt Oec.* From this it is abundantly clear that changes everywhere are wilful. (*Sod* adds a few codd. varying.)

Matt.

vi. 7. *υποκριται* **B** and *syr cu* [*non syr sin pesh diatess*]  
*εθνικοι* all the rest

The verse runs: "προσευχομενοι δε μη βαττολογησθε ωσπερ οι εθνικοι · δοκουσι γαρ οτι εν τη πολυλογια αυτων εισακουθησονται."

Clearly *υποκριται* is an "improvement," being set up as a better antithesis to *βαττολογησητε* than *εθνικοι* would seem to be. There is nothing "neutral" about this, and *Origen* is against it. *Mirabile dictu* *W-H* do not follow *B* here. How can *Hort* then account for what he wrote (p. 237) about the "simple and inartificial character" of "the few remaining individualisms of *B*," "happily guiltless of ingenuity or other untimely activity of the brain"?

See *Hort* vol. ii. 'Select Rdgs.' p. 10 on Matt. vii. 13 "Or, as we rather suspect, as one of those rare rdgs. in which the true text has been preserved by *Σ* without extant support, owing to the exceptional intrusion of a late element into *B* (of which some examples occur further on in this Gospel)." But *B* is full of these intrusions and not only in Matthew!

Matt.

xi. 15. — *ακουειν* BD 32 174 604 *d k syr sin* (ο *εχων* ωτα [*ακουειν*] *ακουετω*)

xiii. 9. — *ακουειν* *ΣBL* *a e ff<sub>1</sub> k syr sin* (ο *εχων* ωτα [*ακουειν*] *ακουετω*)

Here it is clearly seen that *B k* and *syr sin* are the consistent ones in omitting. It might be thought basically "neutral" (= shorter text) but that there would be no reason to add *ακουειν* as all the rest do including *copt*.

xiii. 43. — *ακουειν* *Σ\*B Sod*<sup>050</sup> 604 *a b e k vg*<sup>14</sup> [*non D d syr sin †*]

xii. 48. *τω λεγουντι* (*pro* *τω ειποντι*) *ΣBDZII\** 7 33 892 *Evst<sup>a</sup> aliq.*

Following *ειπεν* to avoid tautology. See similar case at Luke ix. 21. (*Soden* follows *Hort* here in Matthew.)

Other instances of this can be adduced, as at Matt. xxvi. 26. For *ευχαριστησας* of most (and *W* 28) *ευλογησας* is substituted by *text recept* with *ΣBDLCGZ min*<sup>aliqua</sup> for the blessing of the bread. This appears very like an effort to vary the *ευχαριστησας* occurring again in the following verse 27 of the cup. For note that in St. Paul's account in 1 Cor. xi. 24/25 the expression is *ευχαριστησας* and that of the BREAD.

24/25. *ελαβεν αρτον και ευχαριστησας εκλασε και ειπε* (λαβετε φαγετε) *τουτο μου εστι το σωμα το υπερ υμων (κλωμενον) τουτο ποιειτε εις την εμην αναμνησιν. ωσαντως και το ποτηριον. . .*

Thus *ευχαριστησας* is tied to the bread, and *ωσαντως* implies *ευχαριστησας de novo* as to the cup.

Whichever way we turn the *ΣB* grouping seems to be convicted of an endeavour to improve; in this case however the *textus receptus* is involved as well. Here *Griesbach* and *Scholz* I believe rightly oppose it. For such repetition is not distasteful to the Semitic mind. (See beyond on Matt. xix. 4.) But *Soden* reproduces *ευχαριστησας* in Matt.

Matt.

xiii. 36. *διασαφησον* (*pro* *φρασον*) *Σ\*B* (*Orig semel*) *syr*, but no cursives. *Sod* adds 1 and <sup>050</sup> of uncials, of *fam* φ<sup>a</sup> four cursives, and prints *διασαφησον* in his text. Of the five next, four are omissions:

† But *syr sin* has ~~ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ~~ for ~~ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ~~ of *syr cu*. *Syr cu* has *ακουειν* both at xi. 15 and xiii. 9.

Matt.

- xiii. 45. *εμπορω* (*pro ανθρωπω εμπορω*) **N\*B** 1 50 59 *Sod*<sup>duo</sup> *Ath Cyr* 1/2  
*Chrys Ambr* [*Habent Orig Cypr gr plur syrr diatess arab latt*]  
*om εμπορω* *v*<sup>F</sup> *diatess*

The two words occupy one line in D *d*, and *Cyr* 1/2 is significant, while *Orig* and *Cypr* flatly contradict **NB** [*Tert* is silent].

The coptic is interesting, for unlike *Gr-syr-lat* order: *ανθρ. εμπορω* they say *εμπορω ανθρωπω* a "merchant-man" as we would say in English.

- xvi. 13. *τινα (με) λεγουσιν οι ανθρωποι ειναι (τον) υιου του ανου*  
*quem (me) dicunt homines esse filium hominis.*

This *με* is omitted by **NB** 604 *Sod*<sup>duo</sup> [no other Greeks] *syr hier copt aeth* only *c* of O.L. and some *v*<sup>gg</sup> *codd* (8) against *Hier* specifically.

*με* is included by *syr* *it pl* and *Iren* and all other Greeks. Clearly this omission is not "shorter" text, but constructional improvement. There could not be a clearer case where the Syriacs are specific with the Latin, and the Coptic only support **NB** as a distinctly Egyptian group joined by *aeth* and *c* also clearly of Egyptian provenance, yet *Soden* excludes.

[**N**'s graeco-latin tendency is seen clearly in the neighbourhood  
 xvi. 27 *τα εργα* for *την παξιν* with *d* [*contra D<sup>sr</sup> την παξιν*] *opera sua* and other Latins and *copt*.

No doubt the origin of the plural is due to an old unpointed syriac preceding the Latins which could be read either way. Hence as Latins and Greeks (except **N\*F** *min*<sup>alii</sup>) divide squarely here, the Latins did not get it from the Greeks but from the Syriac.]

Matt.

- xxi. 12. "*και εισηλθεν ο ιω̄ εις το ιερου του θεου.*"

But **NBL** 13 33 73 604 892 *Sod*<sup>alii</sup> *sah boh aeth b Meth Chr Hil* and *Origen* 2/5 omit *του θεου*. On the supposition of the "shorter" text of course *W-H* follow suit with the omission. But is it not a gross mistake? Who would *put in του θεου*? "And Jesus went into the Temple" is quite sufficient. If the original writer did not have *του θεου* why should any add? The plain fact remains that *Origen* being on both sides gives away the change as an arbitrary excision, for the words appeared redundant. I cannot allow that the *addition* was made by scribes, but claim that **NBL** omitted as a redundancy. This is one of the few places treated by *W-H*. See their note in vol. ii. ('Select Readings') p. 15. What they mean by "overwhelming"† evidence for omission I fail to see, "overwhelming" meaning only three uncials (closely related), a pitiful handful of cursives, the *arm* (all MSS?) *aeth*, and *coptic*,

† They write: "The absence of *του θεου* from Mc xi. 15 Lc xix. 45 (*cf* Jo. ii. 14) at all events cannot weigh against the overwhelming documentary authority for omission." But the omission is doubtless traceable to *Origen*, who in his commentary on John (Book x. § 15) cites the three Gospel accounts, leaving out *του θεου* in Matthew, as in Mark and Luke where the words are really absent. Elsewhere when quoting Matthew *Origen* has them. *Soden* holds *του θεου* against **NBL** and his <sup>ooo</sup>, although he has been religiously following them in a host of other things! Why are they right elsewhere if wrong here?

with *Origen* against them in proportion of 3 to 5 on the side of all other Gk documents and all Latins but *b*, and all *syrr*, while *syrr cu* actually doubles it, reading "And Jesus entered the temple of God and put forth from the temple of God."

The calling of **NBL** *copt aeth* "overwhelming" is undignified. It represents one single tradition. See under "Coptic" for probable harmonistic reasons for the omission. *Soden* does not omit.

Matt.

xviii. 6. *περι του τραχηλου* (*pro* *επι* or *εις* *τον* *τρ.*) **NBL**  $\Sigma\text{Z}\Sigma\text{7}$  28 157 237 253 258 <sup>y<sup>scr</sup></sup> *al. pauc.* *Orig* (SEMEL) *Bas Cyr bis*

This clearly tells the tale. *Orig* only once, *Cyril* twice. The Latins oppose and the Syriac, but **NB** thought "about his neck" was better. Why are 604 and 892 absent? The *coptic* does not agree with **NB** here. *Schaaf* and *Gwilliam* translate "*ad collum*" for the same *syrr* expression. Only *Burkitt* says "about his neck" for the same *syrr* preposition. It is clearly only a matter of taste, and in view of the circumlocutory nature of syriac prepositions (*Schaaf* p. 114 "circum, circa, ad, juxta, prope") it seems evident that **NB** are only "improving." How could *περι* have dropped out of the rest if basic? *Soden* refuses this "nicety."

xviii. 15. *εαν δε αμαρτηση* (*-εις σε*) *ο αδελφος σου* This is a radical and important change committed by **NB** 1 22 234\* *sah Orig Cyr Bas*<sup>pluries</sup> and clearly wrong. When *D* parts company with **NB** and goes with the mass and when that mass includes all the Latins and *Syrr* we may be sure **NB** with or without *Origen* are striving for improvement. We cannot consider a shorter text *per se*. We must investigate how each of these changes came about. *Boh*<sup>p1</sup> here oppose *sah* with *arm aeth Chr Lucif Hil etc.* who are all conjoined with  $\frac{9}{10}\frac{9}{10}\frac{9}{10}$  of the Greeks plus *Lat* and *Syrr*. *W<sup>gr</sup>* does not omit nor 604 nor 892.

(A reference to *Luke* xvii. 3 where **NB** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> again omit with *AL fam* 1 42 254 892 but also *lat syrr copt Clem Dam (Tert)* shows that the omission in *Matt.* was probably influenced by their *Lucan* text.)

This is immediately followed by an *addition* which I do not believe is original but due to the "version tradition."

*Matt.* xviii. 19 for *υμων* of most Gks **NBDL** 892 substitute *εξ υμων* with *syrr* [this seems to be opposed by a much older authority namely *Ignatius*<sup>Ephes 4</sup>].

*1071*<sup>v</sup> 4. *ο κτισας απ αρχης αρσεν και θηλυ εποιησεν αυτους.* *B* 1 22 *so* 33 124 604 *Sod*<sup>750 178</sup> & *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> *boh sah Orig*<sup>bis</sup> *Tit Bostr Method* *r* *Ath Clem*<sup>hom</sup> use *κτισας* for the more Semitic *ποιησας* of all the rest.

I ask what can be more clearly an endeavour to improve? It avoids the tautology involved and seems clearly borrowed from *Mark* x. 6 "*απο δε αρχης κτισεως αρσεν και θηλυ εποιησεν αυτους.*"

The double use of *ποιεω* in *Matthew* is not abhorrent to the Latins,

and the Syriacs use the same word **ܚܒܐ** twice. Nor was it abhorrent to the translators of the LXX, who render Gen. i. 27:

*και εποιησεν ο θεος τον ανθρωπον · και εικονα θεου εποιησεν αυτον · αρσεν και θηλυ εποιησεν αυτους.*

(Hebrew is **yivra** **יִבְרָא** **bara** **בָּרָא** **bara** **בָּרָא**.)

In the small support accorded to B note that 124 opposes the family traditions of *fam* 13 which do not agree, and 1 opposes 118-209. Nothing can be clearer that *κτιστας* is editorial.

Similarly in the same chapter verse 18 B 13-124-346-556 write *εφη* for *ειπεν* opposing all the rest and 69. Can we really suppose the later *εφη* to be "neutral" opposing all other documents?

Note that in the *answer* of the young man at Mark x. 20 the record of **NB(C)Δ** is *εφη*, and returning to Matt. xix. 18 note that at the beginning instead of *λεγει αυτω ποιας*, **NL** substitute *ποιας φησιν*, and B 13 *εφη αυτω ποιας*, all apparently in the nature of corrections, yet not in agreement with each other.

Two verses lower Matt. xix. 20 we find *Origen* (as well as *A*, opposing the correction of **NBDL** 1 22 604 of *εφυλαξα* for *εφυλαξαμην* while *εφυλαξα* is read in Mark x. 20 by *Orig Clem DA* and 28 [not 28 in Matthew] and there in Mark opposed by **NBCNWX**. In Luke xviii. 21 most read *εφυλαξαμην* but **NABL** *fam* 1 *εφυλαξα*. It would seem as if in both Matthew and Mark **NB** take the wrong line.

xxiv. 16. *φευγετωσαν εις τα ορη* **BDΔΣ** 892 *min aliq Patr et latt* for *φ. επι τα ορη*. It is much more likely that *επι* should be changed to *εις*, than *εις* to *επι*. The idea being in the minds of the grammarians that it was a flight to ("in montes" *Orig<sup>int</sup> Iren<sup>int</sup> Cypr Aug Hier r vgg*) although most Old Latins retain the abl. *in montibus* (with only *vg<sup>2</sup>*), whereas *επι τα ορη* is the more difficult and the most likely, signifying flight to the mountains and upon them when there.

As to Luke xxi. 21 all Gks (but two) have *εις* there. Hence the excuse to harmonise in Matthew is greedily availed of by B. I can see no other outlet. I will not admit that nearly all other Greeks substitute a more difficult *επι* in Matthew.

### *Improvement (Addition).*

Matt.  
xxvi. 44 *fin.* *τον αυτον λογον ειπων + παλιν*. This *παλιν* is added by **NBL** *Sod<sup>50</sup>* 124 (against the family) † *a* and *boh* [*non sah*]. There is no particular reason for this (*syr sin* "and again thus he spake"; *arm* "and again the same word he said") unless erroneously incorporated from the *παλιν* occurring above "*παλιν απελθων προσηυξατο*," for "*τον αυτον λογον ειπων*" is quite sufficient. Here is an absolute contradiction of the

† *Soden* misquotes his <sup>257</sup> (*Scrivener* "a" Adv. Sacr.)

"shorter" text theory, and an abominable redundancy. No cursives but 124 seem to join, and as to *a* it occasionally does this kind of thing, *e.g.* *John* iii. 4 homo + *ut* nos.† *Soden* places this second *παλιν* in his text.

Given the ordinary copying of MSS, which was faithful enough in the main, how could *παλιν* be dropped by *all* the rest?

*Removing redundancy.*

Matt.

xi. 25. *οτι εκρυψας ταυτα απο σοφων και συνετων* NBD 12  
*Clem<sup>hom</sup> (sed Clem<sup>hom</sup> libere) Sod<sup>txt</sup> non MSS*

All others have *απεκρυψας..απο* with *Iren<sup>sr</sup> Eus Orig.*

This seems clearly to savour of the removal of redundant *απ* from the verb. Alone it might not seem so, but in connection with the other points in the indictment it would seem to hold good.

(The Latins can yield nothing of interest here; *sah* seems to favour NBD "thou hiddest these *for*," but *boh* is "*from*." Coming close on syriac influence in verse 23 (see elsewhere) *εκρυψας* may trace to this.)

See in St. Luke as to simple and compound verbs.

*Further, consider the following improvement :*

vi. 5. *και οταν προσευχησθε ουκ εσεσθε ως οι υποκριται* N† BZ 1 22  
 372 892 *Sod<sup>178</sup> a b (c h nolite esse) f ff<sub>1</sub> g<sub>2</sub> δ [contra Δ<sup>sr</sup>]*  
*l vg goth sah boh aeth syr hier arm<sup>cod</sup> Orig Chr Aug*  
*Sod<sup>txt</sup>*

*και οταν προσευχη ουκ εση ωσπερ οι υποκριται* DW *rell syr*  
*cu d k q [om ver. sin] diatess (hiant e ff<sub>2</sub> m r r<sub>2</sub>)*

† In this connection it may be interesting to connect *a* with B<sup>sr</sup>, which can be done in several places. But they touch in quite a peculiar matter of order, which deserves notice, at Luke viii. 23. For

{ *και κατεβη λαιλαψ ανεμου εις την λιμνην* of all Gks  
 { *et descendit procella venti in stagnum* of Latins

B alone has *κ, κατεβη λαιλαψ εις την λιμνην ανεμου* }  
 and *a et descendit turbo in stagnum venti* }

*Wordsworth* does not notice this order in *a*, although quoting G b e l q for omission of *in stagnum* (add for omission ff as in *Tisch* confirmed by *Buchanan*). The point I want to bring out is that B is therefore in no way "neutral" or "pre-syrian" here. He goes with a document generally called *Western* or *European* or *Italian* (although *a* is really graeco-syriac-latin) and does so in a place where the omission by other Latins shows how the change of order probably took place owing to some confusion here. Hence B *a* in combination once more disproves "neutrality" for B and classes him with our other documents as a *mixture*. I will emphasise the point further from a passage very close by, viz. Luke viii. 29. Instead of *ηλαινετο υπο του δαιμονιου εις τας ερημους*, B supported only by Ξ (against N and all the rest) allows himself to substitute *απο* for *υπο*, which must equate LATIN use of *a daemonio* for agency as sometimes elsewhere.

† N\* leaves out *ουκ εσεσθε* by mistake. N\* in correcting gives *και οταν προσευχη ουκ εσεσθε* (showing he knew both readings) and N<sup>c</sup> has to set the matter straight.



This is absolutely and clearly an improvement by a small coterie as above. In verse 3 it runs σου δε ποιουτος ελεημοσυνην so that at first sight we might think that the majority had corrected the plural in ver. 5 to accord with this singular in ver. 3, but why then, in the first place, allow the plural οι υποκριται to stand in ver. 5? If Antioch had done the revising here they might have changed the hypocrites to "a hypocrite" or "the hypocrite," but then they would have had to alter the whole of the rest of the verse. In the second place it is quite clear that NBZ did the revising (the inevitable Origen joins them) in order to avoid a singular comparison with a plural following. In the third place the change is opposed by DW *d k † q* and *syr cu pesh diatess* definitely [*sin*, the cautious, omits the verse]. For some reason Tisch misstates the evidence, only giving *q* on the side of D *d*, while he gives *it<sup>p</sup>* on the other side. But if ever there was a place where we must balance correctly this is one. We now see that *it<sup>p</sup>* is wrong, for *d k q* witness for the side of D *d*, and  $\delta$  opposing  $\Delta^{\text{sr}}$  shows it was the *later* latin witness which caused this. Sod cannot even produce <sup>550</sup> for this.

One word more. Origen, who approves the course of NBZ, nevertheless writes ωσπερ for ως (of NBDZ 33), showing that while they were about it NBZ took the opportunity to make this other change, for they prefer ως to ωσπερ on a good many other occasions.

We might refer to Luke xxii. 31/32 for further illustration: Σίμων Σίμων ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σιναῖσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σου ἵνα μὴ ἐκλήπῃ ἡ πίστις σου.

Here *c* seeing the difficulty writes *ad cernendum* without ὑμᾶς, but Tertullian "*uti cerneret vos*," and Cyprian "*ut vos vexaret*."

Another such transition (which Bornemann admits is "intentional") occurs at Luke v. 4 and is highly instructive, for again another Evangelist is reproducing our Lord's own words: ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμονα: ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος, καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄβυσσον. We cover this transition in English by saying "Launch out ['put out,' R.V.] into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught," but the Latins cannot cover it, and they say "Duc (or adduc) in altum, et laxate...."†

St. Paul is not averse to the method. Observe 2 Cor. xi. 6 "εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει· ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ φανερωθέντες (or φανερώσαντες) ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς." This is not quite so obvious, as ἐγώ

---

† Horner simply follows Tischendorf and only quotes *q*, so that he has failed to clear the matter. *k* has "et cum adoras non erit sicut hypocritae." Unfortunately *e ff<sub>2</sub>* are wanting and *m r r<sub>2</sub>*. If we refuse *d k syr cu* (conjoined here) a heavy vote in the proceedings what is the use of talking of them elsewhere as primary witnesses? The public cannot judge intelligently when the evidence of these witnesses is obliterated from carelessness.

† Wiclif is however true, and says "Lede thou into depthe, and slake your nettis to take fisch."

with infinite reserve (as is usual with St. Paul) is suppressed. In our English version on the other hand we have to bring it into prominence: "But though *I* be rude in speech yet not in knowledge [emphatically R.V. 'yet *am I* not in knowledge'] but *we* have been thoroughly made manifest among you in all things." (R.V. varies this diction.)

Another beautiful example is forthcoming in St. Paul's writings, which although a little long I am tempted to reproduce here and put it on record in this connection. I refer to Rom. xii. 16-20.

Ver 16 is *plural*: τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονούντες· μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονούντες, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι· μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς.

Follows a kind of singular idea holding the *plural*:

Ver 17, 18, 19. μὴδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες· προσοφύμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων· εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες· μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ (γέγραπται γὰρ "Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος.")

Now follows immediately the *singular*, only separated by the parenthetical quotation above:

Ver 20. Ἐὰν οὖν (vel ἀλλὰ ἐὰν) πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν, ἀνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

The interesting part is that he holds this singular in ver. 21 instead of summing up with the plural:

μὴ νικῶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, ἀλλὰ νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν.

This again is lost in our English, for we translate:

"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good," which might be "Be thou..." or "Be ye..."

Now to return to Matt. vi. 5 and Luke v. 4. Of course there are no cross references between these two verses, yet it is instructive to note a point which occurs here. There are no variations among MSS in Luke v. 4 except as to *ὡς δε* or *ὡς τε* (D *d a e*) at the beginning, but at the end *fam* 1 and 22 *Sod*<sup>178</sup> omit *εἰς ἀγρὰν*. Now these (*fam* 1 and 22 *Sod*<sup>178</sup>) are the very MSS which alone support *NBZ* in Matt. vi. 5. I may say here that we are very much in need of a new collation of *Evan* 22. We do not know, to this day, whether "colb" or "colb unus" of Wetstein's Colbert Group means 22 or another. Consult Matt. vi. 18 a very little way further on, *κρυφαῖω* (for *κρυπτῶ*) *bis* is found only in *NB(D)* 1 [against 118-209 this time] and 22 372 *Sod*<sup>178</sup>, showing they are simply descendants of the same family. [372 (= *Sod*<sup>600</sup>) joins here, absolutely of B family, not recorded above.] *Soden*<sup>txt</sup> *κρυφαῖω*.

*κρυφαῖος* is more classical (or poetic, *Pindar Aesch Soph*; *Xen Plato* use both) than *κρυπτῶ*, but only occurs in the N.T. as *κρυφή* Eph. v. 12.

But, I may be told, do you mean to put aside *NBZ Orig* supported by *sah boh goth it<sup>s</sup> Aug*? And I say yes, because before the benevolent

reader will have finished perusing these pages he will find that **SBZ** *Orig sah boh* represent but one text recension, and *it<sup>s</sup> Aug* no doubt are turning a difficulty † as well, seeing that they are not supported by *d k* (unfortunately *ff<sub>2</sub>* is wanting here in the early part of Matthew). Adhesion of the *gothic* here to **SBZ** is unusual and might be considered a balancing factor, but for the fact that it is abandoning its usual adherence to the *other* group, and therefore I consider its position to be suspicious also of "improvement." As we find the *syriac* stand aloof from **SBZ** with *d k D* and all other Greeks we can see pretty clearly that the singular in apposition to the plural following is the correct reading and not the converse.

As a matter of fact we ourselves are in the habit of using the same construction. We say currently "Don't be like the sharks down in the market place" (meaning "Do not thou be like...") Similarly the French say: "Ne sois pas comme les Anglais qui..." or the Germans: "Sei nicht wie die Amerikaner..." ‡

Finally observe in the same chapter vi. 16 *αφανιζουσιν γαρ το προσωπον* **S** 244 *g<sub>1</sub> k syr presh pers* for *αφανιζουσιν γαρ τα προσωπα*.

Note also in Matt. vii. 16 *μητι συλλεγουσιν απο ακανθων σταφυλην* **C<sup>2</sup>EGKLSUVWXΔΠ al. pl arm aeth Lucif** (although opposed by **SB(C)** *fam* 1 22 892 *latt syr goth copt* with *σταφυλας*) may be the right reading; observe **LWX** for *σταφυλην* and *Clem* (but cf. Luke vi. 44).

*Improvement (continued).*

Matt.

- vi. 8. Addition: *ο θεος ο πατηρ υμων* **S<sup>\*</sup>B sah [W-H] non Sod<sup>nec</sup> MSS**  
*ο πατηρ υμων* **D rell et verss sine ο θεος**
- vii. 8. *ανοιγεται (pro ανοιγησεται fin)* **B only (and syr cu boh Aphraat)**.  
 Clear "improvement" to correspond with *λαμβάνει* and *ευρισκει* above, against *Clem S* and all other Greeks, Latins and *sah*. **B** does it again (alone with **D**, which is here wanting) at Luke xi. 10 absolutely for the same reason. *Sod* attributes both readings to mere error (p. 908 Band I Abt. II). He is indeed charitable. But *W-H* do not agree with him, printing them *marg.* in both places.
- ix. 28. Order: *οτι τουτο δυναμαι ποιησαι* only **B l q** and *vg<sup>ed</sup>* against *οτι δυναμαι* in first position all others and versions (although varying somewhat otherwise; see under **SB** in Part II).
- x. 2. *+ και ante ιακωβος* **SB d (contra D<sup>gr</sup>) syr (contra rell gr et latt sah boh aeth)**. When **SB** abandon coptic sympathy there is always a reason, and this must have been considered an improvement. Why should all the rest drop it? (*+ και Sod<sup>179</sup> sol*).

† They are clearly wrong with **B** again in vi. 22 reading, "The light of the body is thine eye" (from Luke xi. 34) instead of "the eye." **S** here opposes **B**, and with *f goth syr sah omu boh omu* and *Clem Eus* is certainly right.

‡ See Winer, p. 778 ('Breviloquence,' section 2 f.) comparing Xenophon (Cyr. 5, 1. 3) *ομοιαν ταις δουλαις ειχε την εσθητα*. As to Luke v. 4 it is referred to on p. 725.

Matt.

- x. 3. θαδδαιος (*pro λεβαιος*) **NB** 17 124 *sah boh c ff<sub>1</sub> g<sub>2</sub> l* [*Non clare Sod*]  
 13. εφ υμας (*pro προς υμας*) **NBW** 174 (243) 372 892 *Sod*<sup>190 1253</sup>.  
 This is done to complete the idea of "pairs" in the sentence *ειρηνη υμων επ' αυτην*, and *ειρηνη υμων εφ' υμας επιστραφητω*, if indeed it be not borrowed from Luke x. 6 *επ' αυτον. . εφ' υμας*. Actually 243, instead of strengthening **NB**, shows this by adding *ανακαμψει* from Luke. There is no earthly reason why all other documents should *substitute* *προς* for *εφ'* if *εφ'* were original. The Latins oppose and both coptics differentiate. Needless to say *W-H* fall into the trap. *Soden* does not.

I wish to add that **N** (with C 157 *Sod*<sup>94 190</sup> only) confirms my view as to "pairs" immediately afterwards, for at x. 15, not content with *γη σοδομων και γομορρων*, it adds a second *γη*, writing *γη σοδομων και γη γομορρων*. That this is absolutely gratuitous is proved by the abstention of the friendly versions.

We shall see much more later and throughout the Gospels as to this matter of "pairs" by the Egyptian school.

#### *Improvement (Order).*

- xi. 26. *οτι ουτως >ευδοκια εγενετο εμπροσθεν σου* **NBW** 1 33 892 *k*  
*οτι ουτως >εγενετο ευδοκια εμπροσθεν σου* *Rell*

The versions do not support **NB** here. In Luke x. 21 **BC\*LXΞ** (a perfect family coterie, but against **N** as well as the rest) have also *ευδοκια εγενετο* and there with many Old Latins.

#### *Improvement "Niceties."*

- xi. 29. *πραυς* **NBC\*D Sod**<sup>351</sup> *Clem* 1/2 *Orig bis Ath* 1/2 *Bas* 1/4 *Cyr* 1/2  
*πραος* *Rell omn et min omn vid Orig*<sup>saepo</sup> *Eus*<sup>saepo</sup> *Ath* 1/2  
*Bas* 3/4 *Cyr* 1/2 *Chr; et Clem(Strom)* *λαβετε τον πραον*

A glance at this will, I think, show Alexandrine scholarship preferring the rarer form. Observe how the Fathers are divided against themselves, with the balance in favour of *πραος*. Hort says (vol i. p. 549) "The perpetuation of the purer text may in great measure be laid to the credit of the watchful scholars of Alexandria, . . ." but here, as elsewhere, the readings vary in different places in their writings. They were far from being "watchful," but they did enjoy "niceties" even if not consistent in the application of them.

- ix. 13 and xii. 7. Under this head may perhaps be placed *ελεος* (for *ελεον*) by **NBCD**<sup>8r</sup> 1 33 in both places (and again xxiii. 23). Note that all others oppose as well as *d* and *Clem*<sup>alex</sup> (against *Origen*). The **LXX** reading (of most of its MSS) of *ελεος* would account for *ελεος*.

For observe in this connection, and in this vicinity, Matt xii. 17/18 *να πληρωθη το ρηθεν δια Ησαιου (xlii. 1/4) του προφητου λεγοντος ιδου ο*

[D<sup>gr</sup> indeed here writes  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  *ov* for the *first ov* (as *syr*) against *quem* of *d* opposite, and D<sup>gr</sup> has  $\epsilon\nu$   $\omega$  for the second  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  *ov*.]

(Questionable.)

“ Nicety ” :

This seems a strengthening "nicety" on the part of B, for

Another "nicety" (favoured by *W-H* and *Sod text*<sup>et 050 94</sup>) occurs at:

57. The "pair" of clauses here: "in his country and in his house" has given rise to a great deal of variety.

We see Origen as usual divided against himself, yet not supporting BD for the “shorter” text, which here I believe to be a mistake by BD.

A study of such "pairs" conveys a good deal of information. Thus at Luke xx. 20: To "deliver him unto the power and authority of the Governor." § 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> and three lectionaries write *τη αρχη και εξουσια του ηγεμ.*, eliding the second article before *εξουσια*. I mention it because *Tisch* omits this in his notes (it is added in Gregory's 'Emendanda') and because the Coptic *ne* for *kai* (although it retains the article

prefixed to the second noun) may have given rise to this. "Pairs," therefore, are always worth watching.† *Sod* has no new support for **Σ**.

<sup>Matt.</sup>

- xiv. 33. **NBC<sup>2</sup>T<sup>c</sup>** 1 22 892\* *min<sup>10</sup> ff<sub>1</sub> copt aeth (Orig?) Did omit ελθοντες.*  
This is peculiarly interesting, for although 1 omits, 118-209 with 28 substitute *οντες*. The very manner of the coptics shows that they had well considered the place, and they too make a great show of *οντες*. The rest and DW all have *ελθοντες*, which represents a far more graceful act, and *syr cu sin*: "came near and." The point is this. In ver. 32 we read *και αναβαιντων (εμβαντων) αυτων εις το πλοιον εκοπασεν ο ανεμος*. They had already entered the ship, and for some reason *ελθοντες* seemed out of place in ver. 33. It is true it does not read (as Tischendorf would have one suppose) *οι δε ελθοντες εν τω πλοιω . . .*, but *οι δε εν τω πλοιω ελθοντες προσεκυνησαν αυτω*. But *ελθοντες* has been removed and not added, I feel sure.

Another "nicety" obtains in the following verse:

- xiv. 34. *ηλθον επι την γην* **NBCD<sup>gr</sup>NT<sup>c</sup>WΔΣΦη** † *fam* 13 33 157 238 245 *Sod<sup>novem</sup> e* "ad terram" (*sah εβραι ειπκαρ, boh εδουσι ειπκαρι*) *syr, et syr cu sin diserte*  
*ηλθον εις την γην* *E rell omn latt* "in" *et d Orig<sup>ter</sup> et Sod txt*

This is a distinction and a "betterment." *d* opposes *D* and *Origen* is against the **NB** group, whose adherents are none too many. I consider *e* to be wrongly grouped by *Tisch* and *Horner* and to belong to the side I have put it on.

[A touch suggested by *Origen* in xiv. 36 is rejected by **NB**, but not by some of their followers. He would have (*bis*) *ινα καν μονον αφωνται* with **Φ** 1 [*non* 118-209] *fam* 13 [*non* 124] 22 33 *al. alig.* All the uncials have *ινα μονον αφωνται*. The *vg* and some *itala* (but not *d e* "ut tantum") have "ut vel fimbriam . . ." and *f* "ut tantum vel fimbriam." ]

- xv. 35/36. *και παραγγελιας . . . ελαβεν* **NBD<sup>gr</sup>** 1 *fam* 13 33 *W-H Sod*  
(*Orig ενθαδε δε ου κελευει αλλα παραγγελλει*)  
*και εκελευσε . . . και λαβων* *Rel Gr fl q vg*  
*αφπαραγγειλε δε . . . αφχι* *sah*  
*οτοz αφχοπρεη . . . αφδι* *boh*  
*και εκελευσε . . . και ελαβεν* *syr a b c e g<sub>1</sub> k (et praecepit et accepit)*

*et cum iussisset . . . accepit* *d*

First observe that *Origen* directs this operation on the part of

† We may cite another instructive instance where **Σ** and not **B** is offended at a "pair" of readings and cancels the second. It is all in the same neighbourhood (see xiii. 28, under Coptic). This occurs at *Matt. xii. 37*. **Σ** alone prefers *εκ γαρ των λογων σου δικαιοωθησθ και εκ των λογων (-σου) καταδικασθησθ*. *Soden* does not add one single new witness.

† *Soden* refuses *επι* (upon what principle?) against all his *π* family and nine new witnesses.

**NBD<sup>gr</sup>**. The comparison is with xiv. 19 where **NZ** *Orig* had *εκελευσεν* (against *κελευσας* of most, *κελευσατε* B\* *Sod*<sup>443</sup>). Observe *sah* uses a different word here from the one in xiv. 19, transliterating in xv. 35 but not using the participle. *d* does not agree with the exact participial form of D, nor do any Latins, nor is it borne out by *syr*. As in 36 *init. Syrr* and *latt* (except *d*) maintain the *και ελαβεν* of the Greeks, it looks very much (whether *και παρηγγειλε* be correct or not), as if **NB** had inverted the construction and that *και παρηγγειλε* (or *παρηγγειλε δε* as *sah*)... *λαβων* or *και λαβων* was what was intended, and not *και παραγγειλας*... *ελαβεν*. For the question is as between "Commanding the multitude to sit down...he took the seven loaves..." or "And he commanded the multitude to sit down...and taking..."

Follows another case of probable "finessing":

**Matt.**

xvi. 19. *τας κλειδας (pro τας κλεις)* **N\*B\*** (both corrected) **LW** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *Orig* 4/5 against *τας κλεις* by all others and **N<sup>c</sup>B<sup>c</sup>** *Orig* 1/5 *Eus Chr Phot*. Doubtless *Origen* caused this.

xvii. 4. *ποιησω (pro ποιησωμεν)* **NBC\*** 174 604 *b ff<sub>1</sub> ff<sub>2</sub>*. This is different. Because, as *ποιησωμεν* obtains in Mark and Luke (ix. 5, ix. 33), it might be thought that this *ποιησω* was the "neutral" text in Matthew. I think it is a mistake however, as both coptics are against it, as all the syriacs and *Origen* distinctly. This is a place where we may emphasise the importance of a concurrent study of the versions.

They are so often with us in whole or in part, that their absence here is very important. How come *b* and *ff<sub>1,2</sub>* of the Latins to join? In the first place *faciam* occupies the last place in the short line of *b* and a ligature for *us* may easily have disappeared or been omitted in copying *b* or the parents of *b ff<sub>1,2</sub>*. As to the parallels, D only indulges in *ποιησω* in Luke (*d facio*), but in Mark D *d* for *ποιησω* and *faciam* are joined by no Greeks but by *b i ff<sub>2</sub>*, all Latin support therefore. The point is perhaps not worth debating, but I incline to think it is an ancient Latin error which has crept into the three places. It is very curious that D, who perpetrates *ποιησω* alone among Greeks in Mark and Luke, should be absent from **NBC** in Matthew. But the other versions are check enough, without speaking of the absence of 892 and others.

A little matter of order follows however in the verse which is highly instructive. B and *e* alone write *σκηνας τρεις* for *τρεις σκηνας* of all the rest and the versions, incl. Latin. But in Luke this is the order (and of some in Mark). *Ergo*, B was looking at a parallel, and that parallel probably Luke ix. 33, and his conjunction with *e* in Matt. shows a *Latin* sympathy which may have extended to and account for *ποιησω* as well.

xvii. 7. *και αφαμενος αυτων* for *και ηφατο αυτων και* **NB** 892 only.

Anyone who will consult the beginning of this verse with its

Matt.

three verbs will see that there is an opening for finessing; **NB** avail of it; so does *sah*, and so do some Latins in other respects. But I expect *boh* or *syr* is nearest the truth. *Soden* follows **NB** 892 with <sup>550</sup>. See his note.

xvii. 15. *κακως εχει* (*pro κακως πασχει*) **NBLZ**<sup>vid</sup>ΣΠ *Sod*<sup>550</sup> *cum Orig Chr*<sup>cod</sup>. This is against the versions as well as the remaining Greeks. *Soden* refuses *εχει*. Cf *Marc* ix. 17 *εχοντα π̄να αλαλον*.

20. *ολιγοπιστιαν...μεταβα...ενθεν...for απιστιαν...μεταβηθι...εντευθεν* may be considered, as the variations are so numerous. See the evidence.

xviii. 7. *αναγκη γαρ* (—*εστιν*) **BLNΣΦΠ** *Sod*<sup>550</sup> 1 33 *al. pauc*. This seems to be an "improvement" (cf *Hebr* ix. 16 23 *etc*) and is not witnessed to by **N** *rell* nor the Latins. In the Gospels we can only compare with *Luke* xiv. 18 *εχω αναγκην*, and xxi. 23 *εσται γαρ αναγκη*, where all are agreed (+*Luke* xxiii. 17 *αναγκην δε ειχεν*). **BL** are opposed here in *Matt.* by *Origen*.

8. Here is another question of "pairs." "If thy hand or thy foot offend thee cut *them* off." This plural offends our super-sensitive Alexandrian ear, so *αυτον* is substituted for *αυτα* by **NBDL** 1 *fam* 13 157 243 245 *Sod*<sup>pauc</sup> with *latt sah* [*contra boh*] *syr arm aeth Lucif Hil*, and *αυτην* *U* 28. I prefer the harder and less smooth reading *αυτα* with **EFGHKMSVWXΓΔΠΣΦ** *min pl* and *boh*. Observe **X** deserts the Latins here and **W** is against **NBDL**. *W-H* and *Sod* follow Alexandria. (*Syr cu sin εκκοφον* (—*αυτον*) *και βαλε αυτον απο σου*.) Cf *Marc* ix. 43/45/47 where *χειρ*, *πους*, and *οφθαλμος* are treated separately.

Note **NB** are running with the Latin in this verse. We have the *Latin* order *κυλλον η χωλον* by **NB** 157 <sup>f<sup>scr</sup></sup> against **D** and all the rest and *sah boh syr arm aeth Orig* for *χωλον η κυλλον*. Also *αυτον* for *αυτα*.

xviii. 14. *εν* (*pro εις*) **NBDLM**<sup>mag</sup>**NΣΠ** 32 157 892 *al*<sup>8</sup> *e\** *vg*<sup>z\*</sup>

As regards the two Latins, *unus* being occasionally abbreviated might have led to *unum*. As regards these few Greeks it is plainly an accommodation to and antithesis of *αὐτὸ* in verse 13 of the lost sheep, and a reference to the earlier verses 4/6. There would be no reason to change *εν* to *εις*, but some reason to change *εις* to *εν*. Hence I charge another "nicety" to **NB**. This time *Origen* opposes them with fifteen or sixteen uncials and all the other Latins.

xviii. 25. Another question of "pairs." ... *πραθηναι και την γυναικα και τα τεκνα* So **NB** 1 [*non fam*] 258 604 *Sod*<sup>alig</sup> *txt* only, against *πραθ. και την γυναικα αυτου και τα τεκνα* of all the rest, and of *John Damascene*; the *syr* and *coptic* versions add the possessive to both *γυναικα* and *τεκνα*, so it surely belongs in *one* place. The Latins (except *h r*<sub>2</sub>) are with the mass of Greeks for "*et uxorem ejus et filios*"; only *vg*<sup>R</sup> adds *ejus* after *filios* in line with its syriac stem, and *h r*<sub>2</sub> transfer from *uxorem* to *filios*.



Matt.

xviii. 31. *οὐν* (*pro δε*) Only **NBD** 21 33 *d e W-H*, *non Sod*.

All others including *boh sah latt* have *δε*, except *aeth* (*και* as usual) and *r<sub>2</sub> arm* which omit.

The exigencies of the situation are well illustrated by Horner, who translates the *boh 2ε* by: "So his fellow servants..." Burkitt *syr*: "Now when his fellow servants."

xx. 21. Yet another question of "pairs." From *εἰς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου και εἰς ἐξ εὐωνυμῶν σου* **NB** *Dam* wish to drop the first *σου*, against all others, including *coptic* and the versions. *Soden* cannot produce another ms. A reference to the parallel at Mark x. 37 shows *σου* occupying there the foremost place: *εἰς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν και εἰς σου ἐξ εὐωνυμῶν* (*vel ἀριστερῶν*). There **BDWAΔ** (but not **N**) with 1 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>1353</sup> *b c d ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>1,2</sub> i k q* omit the second *σου*. (*D* and some *Latins* omit the second *σου* in *Matt*.)

34. *ομματων* for *οφθαλμων* **B** with **DLZ** *fam* 13 892 only and *Orig* 1/2 against **N** and the rest. *ομμα* is much more classical than *οφθαλμος* in the connection in which the word is used here; it occurs but once in *N.T.* at Mark viii. 23. (*B* varies the order alone here, placing the possessive first with *coptic*. *Orig* does this once but with *οφθαλμων*, and his other quotation places *αυτων* after *ομματων*.) *Sod* *ομματων txt* without new mss.

xxi. 5. Yet another question of "pairs":

*ἐπι ονον και ἐπι πωλον* **NBLNΣ7** 1 [*non fam*] 124 [*non fam*] 2<sup>pe</sup> (*Sod*) 604 *Sod*<sup>190 1260</sup> *syr sah aeth*; but om. *ἐπι sec.* with **CDW** and the mass, all *latins boh dis. arm* and *Orig*<sup>bis</sup> *Cyr* as **LXX**.

This seems to be a clear "improvement" (against *Origen*). We may be told that as the quotation of the mass agrees with the **LXX** it is the mass which elided the second *ἐπι*. The reply to this insinuation is contained in my other examples of "pairs." I will say no more except that *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> follows *Hort*.

Note. The **LXX** quotation (*Zach.* ix. 9) is *ἐπι υποζυγιον και πωλον νεον*. *Origen* cites five recensions [see quotation in *Tisch*] where *Aquila* has *ἐπι ονου και πωλου υιον οναδων*, *Symmachus*: *ἐπι ονον και πωλον υιον οναδος*, *Theodot*: *ἐπι ονον και πωλον υιον ονου*. In no case does a second *ἐπι* intrude. In the face of this *Westcott* and *Hort* have the temerity (there is no other word for it) to print the **LXX** quotation in capitals following **B**:

ΕΠΙ ΟΝΟΝ

ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΠΩΛΟΝ ΥΙΟΝ ΥΠΟΖΥΓΙΟΥ

6. The very next verse shows *συνεταξεν* (for *προσεταξεν*) borrowed from *Matt.* xxvi. 19, xxvii. 10 by **BCD** 33 604 *Sod*<sup>1353</sup> *Eust* 48 against **NW** and all others and *Orig*<sup>ter</sup> *Eus*<sup>bis</sup>, yet actually incorporated by *W-H* into their text without marginal alternative. The *Latins* differentiate with *praecepit* in xxi. 6, but *constituit* in xxvi. 19, xxvii. 10, yet the *Revisers* follow

Matt.

Hort in both xxi. 5 and xxi. 6, and Souter gives us no footnote evidence. Note that *d* has *praeceperat* in xxi. 6 over against *συνεταξεν*. The parallels in Mark and Luke express the matter differently, so that BCD are merely harmonizing Matthew's language later, forgetting *προσεταιξεν* formerly at i. 24 and viii. 4. (*συντασσω* occurs only in the N.T. at Matt. xxvi. 19, xxvii. 10.) *Sod* refuses *συνεταξεν* here in Matt.

But Hort says (vol. i. p. 556) . . . "render it morally certain that the ancestries of B and  $\aleph$  diverged from a point near the autographs and never came into contact subsequently."

Well then, either B or  $\aleph$  is right here. The whole matter is thus confined to St. Matthew's Gospel. For B we have six witnesses, C and D<sup>sr</sup> Evan 33 604 *Sod*<sup>1353</sup> and *Eust* 48, all witnesses in such a case of rather peculiar character. For  $\aleph$  we have about 2000 witnesses of every possible shade of transmission, including W 892, plus the Latins—en bloc—distinctly, plus Origen three times and Eusebius twice. Yet Hort's and the Revisers' intuition tells them that Origen and Eusebius are wrong to back  $\aleph$ , and that B and six witnesses kept pure from the common herd "at a point near the autographs." This is criticism gone mad. If  $\aleph$  and B divided at a point "near the autographs and never came into contact subsequently" then it is  $\aleph$  here which holds the balance of power by an overwhelming majority. There is practical agreement that St. Matthew used *προσεταιξεν* twice previous to the passage in xxi. 6, and *συνεταξεν* twice subsequently. The central and fifth passage is the one in dispute. By all canons of Law and Logic we declare that  $\aleph$  Origen and Eusebius here give the lie direct to BCD<sup>sr</sup> Evan 33 604 and *Sod*<sup>1353</sup> *Eust* 48, Hort and the Revisers.

xxi. 18. *πρωι* (*pro πρωιας*)  $\aleph^*BD$  x<sup>scr</sup> only (*cf copt*) *W-H* [*non Sod*]

This appears certainly a preference. If "Antioch" changed *πρωι* to *πρωιας* here why did they not do it elsewhere?

*πρωιας* is left alone at Matt. xxvii. 1 because it is *πρωιας δε γενομενης*, and *δε γενομενης* is probably conveyed by ellipse here at xxi. 18. But  $\aleph BD$  wish to be more precise, preferring to emphasise another "nicety" of scholarship, and write *πρωι*. Consult St. Mark, *πρωι* everywhere. *Πρωιος* is Matthaean and Johannine.

25. Almost another question of "pairs." *το βαπτισμα το Ιωαν(υ)ου*  $\aleph BCZ$  22 33 372 *Sod*<sup>tres</sup> [*non* 157] *Eust* 48 *Orig* against *το βαπτισμα Ιωαννου* D *rell omn Cyr*. In Mark (xi. 30)  $\aleph ABCDLA$  *Sod*<sup>7050</sup> 33 favour the second *το*, in Luke (xx. 4)  $\aleph DLNR$  favour it. (*Sod* quotes  $\pi$  but N only extant.) In Luke then B omits with the mass.

Matt.

- xxi. 46. Another probable "nicety" of *Orig.* *επει* (*pro επειδη*) *Ν(επι)* B D(*επι*) L *fam* 1 22 33 892 *Orig<sup>bis</sup> Sod<sup>337</sup> et txt.* All the rest have *επειδη* (except *στι Sod<sup>quintue</sup>*). Now *επειδη* is apparently not *Matthæan* except here. Cf *Matt.* xviii. 32, xxvii. 6, where *επει* is used. I do not care to emphasise this place for several reasons, and I may be told that D strengthens the combination. Yet observe two things, first that D is not wholly with it, because D says *επι ως* while *ΝBL* 1 22 *Orig<sup>bis</sup> 2/8* say *επει εις* against the mass, and secondly because both coptics have *ζωc* thus contradicting *ΝBL* here. *Tisch* refers to xxi. 26 and xiv. 5 where *ως* remains unchanged. Further note that B 604 ALONE at xiv. 5 substitute *επει* for *στι* there, almost clearly accommodating to xxi. 46. This shows that B fully meant *επει* in the latter perhaps, but it also reveals consideration of the parallels. *Tisch* adds "Contra vero et. in Or duobus locis (de sex) codex praebet *ως pro εις*."
- xxii. 10. This is a most important place. *ΝB\*L* 892 *Sod<sup>190</sup> Cyr* and *W-H* (against *Origen*) and *Soden text* are for forcing St. Matthew to use *νυμφων* here instead of *γαμος*, which latter is used by DW and all other Greeks, *Soden* naming but one new witness against it. Observe carefully that none of the critical cursive codices join here except 892. It is certainly a false reading, but how did it occur?

First of all let us enquire where *νυμφων* is used in the N.T., and we find it in *Matt.* ix. 15, *Mark* ii. 19, and *Luke* v. 34, and in every one of these three cases it is used in alliterative antithesis to *νυμφιος*.

"*μη δυναται οι υιοι του νυμφωνος πενθειν εφ οσον μετ αυτων εστιν ο νυμφιος.*" *Matt.*

"*μη δυναται οι υιοι του νυμφωνος εν ω ο νυμφιος μετ αυτων εστιν νηστευειν.*" *Mark.*

"*μη δυνασθε τους υιους του νυμφωνος εν ω ο νυμφιος μετ αυτων εστιν (ποιησαι) νηστευειν.*" *Luke.*

It is used nowhere else and never in the nominative. It is a rare word anyhow; classically it is used by Pausanias, of the temple of Bacchus, Ceres and Proserpine.

Again I ask how did the three Greeks *ΝBL* work this into their text, or rather I should say, to be quite fair, how did they find it in their texts?

The Latin texts give no assistance, for in accord with the language they all turn *και επλησθη ο γαμος* into the plural (even *d* opposite *D<sup>gr</sup>*) *et repletæ sunt nuptiæ*. The Latin then is hardly involved. But upon consulting the Syriacs we find they say, not "*wedding-feast*," but "*locus convivii*," and this is also found in *sah* (and *aeth*) very definitely: "the place of marriage," *ܥܕܝܢܐ ܡܪܝܬܐ* *ܡܪܝܬܐ*, against *boh* *ܡܪܝܬܐ* *ܡܪܝܬܐ* exactly the same word as used in xxii. 2, 3 for *γαμους*.

I maintain then that this is one of the choicest places we can find

to investigate the matter of the influence of the versions on **NBL** and to ascertain *which* versions. Here we can exclude Latin and Bohairic, and we are left with *syr* and *sah*. It is quite certain that *sah* or *syr* is responsible for this direct influence on **NBL**. It is beyond dispute that ο γαμος and not ο νυμφων is the proper reading here. D is a clear witness here for γαμος, with *all* other Greeks and *Origen* twice and *Chrys.* I think it is criticism gone absolutely wild and mad to accept νυμφων here, and it is unpardonable of *Hort* to put νυμφων in his text without any alternative in the margin and equally wrong of *Soden*. The Revisers, to their credit be it said, eject it, but *Souter* will not give his reasons (as he should) in a footnote. If *Hort* could have seen (as we can now see) the original page of Codex B he would have observed that the B<sup>2</sup>, who went over the whole text, carefully refrained from inking over ο ΝΥΜΦΩΝ (ὁ Γάμος stands in the margin by his hand or that of another corrector). The Revisers by the restoration of γαμος now admit that *Hort* was wrong. If νυμφων then be *not* basic and "neutral," my point is absolutely proved that the versions produced it and influenced **NBL**. If νυμφων be *not* "the true text," then I have won my point all along the line, and the other matters treated of here fall into the regular category of "Improvements," for the *same* influences bear directly on these matters.

I hope in future, when we observe in other places that not a single sympathising cursive stands with **N** or B or L or **NBL**, that we shall make it a canon of criticism to exclude their mal-editing of the text.

[Note, as to absence of minuscule support here, a place like xxii. 25, where γημας (for γαμησας) by **NBL** is supported by ΣΦ *fam* 1 (including 299) 6 22 33 60 75 91 124 [*non fam*] 157 604 892 *Evs*t 48 *Sod*<sup>7050</sup> *Origen*, and is quite on another footing. I mention it here, as I have not listed it elsewhere, and the support is of the regular flock of minuscule birds.

As regards the intimacy of *sah* and *syr* (without **NB**) observe xxii. 18 ειπεν + αυτοις Z<sup>prob</sup> 33 892 *sah syr cu sin* and some *pesh* and *e* and *aeth*.

Note that in xxii. 11 12 ενδυμα γαμου is again rendered by *sah* "the clothing of the *place* of marriage," while *syr* omits this "locus," nor do **NBL** repeat anything but ενδυμα γαμου in both places. Possibly then at xxii. 10 the matter narrows down to *syr* influence on **NBL**.

When *Cyr* on the side of **NBL** opposes *Origen* it is always suspicious of Alexandrian accommodation. See other places. Besides which, *Cyr* and *Origen* are often on both sides of a question in different parts of their writings.]

Matt.

xxii. 16. λεγοντας (*pro* λεγοντες) **NBLT**<sup>h</sup> 27 66 against all the rest and *Dam*. This is quite a clear case in order to refer to αποστελλουσιν τους μαθητας... It would have been impossible for "Antioch" to revise here. λεγοντας is clearly the more natural, and λεγοντες (eschewed by **NBL**) the more difficult.

Matt.

Notice the lone and lorn company of the cursives 27 66 added here. The passage is *και αποστελλουσιν αυτω τους μαθητας αυτων μετα των Ηρωδιανων λεγοντας· διδασκαλε κ.τ.λ.* Soden misquotes 604.

- xxiii. 9. *ο πατηρ ο ουρανιος* [*pro ο πατηρ ο εν (τοις) ουρανοις*] *NBL fam* 13 [*non* 346] 33 238 892 *Bas* 1/2 *Cyr* 1/2, against the rest and *latt copt Clem Eus Nyss Bas* 1/2 *Cyr* 1/2 *Dam*. This is more important than it seems at first sight, for it appears to be a "nicety" of *NBL* to conform to supposed Matthaean usage. *Bas* 1/2 and *Cyr* 1/2 are suspicious marks. Turn to Sir John Hawkins' *'Horae Synopticae,'* p. 32, and there will be found the remark that *ουρανιος* is Matthaean (being only used elsewhere once in Luke ii. 13† and once in Acts xxvi. 19). He lists the Matthaean passages as v. 48, vi. 14 26 32, xv. 13, xviii. 35, xxiii. 9. This from Westcott and Hort's text.‡ Now as to the passages intervening between the first and the last, the remark is correct, but at v. 48 as here at xxiii. 9 the authorities are divided. *Clem* is on both sides at v. 48, and a considerable number witness there for *ουρανιος*, but here at xxiii. 9 it is different, and *Clem Orig Eus* the Latins and Coptics besides all other Greeks witness against *NBL* and three cursives. It is probably therefore a wish to conform to Matthaean diction here. At this rate all individuality will be lost to our synoptists and the problem thrown into confusion. See under xxi. 18 and elsewhere for the same kind of thing. [Soden has *ο ουρανιος* in text but only cites <sup>s371</sup> new.]
- xxv. 18. *ωρυξεν γην* *NB* (*την γην C\* 604*) *L* 33 *ff<sub>1</sub> vg<sup>x</sup> arm boh aeth* (*om ff<sub>2</sub> γην*) against *ωρυξεν εν τη γη* by all the rest, including *D latt sah syr Orig<sup>int</sup>*. I charge this (observe against *sah syr lat<sup>pl</sup>*) to be a deliberate improvement, greedily seized by *Westcott & Hort* and *Sod* (for they have no marginal alternative), but an improvement nevertheless. Why should "Antioch" and even 892 have revised to *εν τη γη*, when *ωρυξεν* nearly always takes the accusative? This is a deliberate Alexandrian nicety of grammar. The word occurred at *Matt* xxi. 33 "*και ωρυξεν εν αυτω ληνον*," and occurs once more only at *Mark* xii. 1 "*και ωρυξεν υπολημιον*," where there was no room for improvement, although even at *Matt*. xxi. 33 *N* saw fit to remove *εν* before *αυτω*. I do not charge this as a harmonistic improvement at all, for in the parallel in *Luke* xix. 20 the servant hides the talent in a napkin, nor did "Antioch" get

† *ουρανιον* is here used, but *B\*D\*d* recognizing that *ουρανιος* is not Lucan change to *ουρανου*. No others change.

‡ Which has befogged the synoptic problem.

Matt.

εν τη γη from Matt. xxv. 25 *εκρυψα το ταλαντον σου εν τη γη.*† It is simply a grammatical improvement. The company kept is merely of a sympathetic order which our other studies lead us to expect here.

- xxv. 27. *εδει σε ουν* (*pro* *εδει ουν σε*) **NBCL** 33 604 892 *y*<sup>scr</sup> *Sod*<sup>7050 98</sup>, against all else and against Coptics and Latins, savours of improvement.
- xxvii. 5. *ριψας τα αργυρια εις τον ναον* (*pro* *εν τω ναω*) **NBL** 33 *fam* 69 99 157 273 604 *Sod*<sup>7050 1443</sup> and versions, but not latin nor *d*. *Orig* and *Eus* are on the side of **NBL** for this improvement with *Sod*. Cf B alone at Matt. x. 16 *ιδου εγω αποστελλω υμας ως προβατα εις μεσον λυκων*, instead of *εν μεσω λυκων*.
42. *πιστευ. επ αυτον* **NBL** 33 42 46 238 243 273 892 *Sod*<sup>quattuor</sup> *Eust* 60 *r*<sub>2</sub> (*sol inter latt cum Aug*) (*syr*) *Cyr*<sup>semel</sup> (*εις αυτον*  $\Sigma$  *min*<sup>4</sup>, *αυτον sah boh*, *αυτω AD min aliq Eus Ps-Ath et latt ei, sed επ αυτω EW unc*<sup>11</sup> *min*<sup>pl</sup>)
44. *συνσταυρωθεντες συν αυτω* **NB** 892  
*σταυρωθεντες συν αυτω* **DL** *latt verss*  
*συνσταυρωθεντες μετ αυτου*  $\Theta$ <sup>t</sup> 157  
 „ *αυτω* **AW** *unc*<sup>12</sup> *rell omn vid*

I should hesitate to class this as an improvement, but for four things, first because  $\Theta$ <sup>t</sup> by improvising *μετ αυτου* shows that there was no *συν* in his copy or he would no doubt have used it, secondly the absence of *any* minuscules to support **NB**, but 892, thirdly the simpler reading of **DL**, and fourthly the general bad record of **NB** in such matters. *Someone* has revised here. I would be willing to accept the reading of **NB** if need be, but we should require a good number of cursives to tell us it was right, whereas neither 1 nor 13 (28 wanting) nor 2<sup>pe</sup> nor 604 come into play at all, while 157 sides with  $\Theta$ <sup>t</sup>.

xxvii. 64. — *αυτον* Only **NB** *arm pers*, but no cursives, and *Tisch W-H txt* [*non R-V Sod*] *Soden* can find no cursives to support.

xxviii. 8. *απελθουσαι* (*pro* *εξελθουσαι*) **NBCL** *fam* 13 33 *Sod*<sup>7050 al.</sup> <sup>4</sup> *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> *etc*. No others do it. Neither W nor 892 nor the coptics.

Burgon points out ('Last twelve verses of St. Mark,' p. 84) that this group **NBCL** 13 33 *e* has ignorantly effected revision here, forgetting that the women were *inside* the grave (Mark xvi. 5 *και εισελθουσαι εις το μνημειον* . . . xvi. 8 *και εξελθουσαι εφυγον απο του μνημειου*; Luke xxi. 3 *εισελθουσαι δε ουχ ευρον το σωμα* . . . 9 *και υποστρεφασαι απο του μνημειου*) and therefore that this is a purely gratuitous emendation by **NBCL** in *Matt*. because in St. Matthew's account the *entrance* into the grave is not specified. I agree with him.

This should, perhaps, come under the head of "Exchange of Prepositions."

† In verse 18 "he dug ('a hole' understood) in the ground." In verse 25 "I hid thy talent in the ground" is different.

Lastly we will adduce some of the passages where

*B and Origen are in conflict :*

- Matt.  
vi. 7. υποκριται B (= Sod<sup>s 30</sup>) *syr cu* only  
εθνικοι the rest and *Orig*

*B or NB and Origen in conflict.*

- xii. 36. Most serious opposition as to the Greek fundamental text :  
ὁ ἐὰν λαληλωσιν *Orig* L and most, against **NB**D (**NB** ὁ (—εαν)  
λαλησουσιν ; D ὁ (—εαν) λαλουσιν), where **NB** take the side of  
*Coptic* and partially of Latin, but Latins (except *d*) have *quod*  
and the *subjunctive*. What are *ff* and *k* doing with “*quod*  
*locuti fuerint*” if **NB**D be right (and these do not agree  
among themselves) ? Has *Origen* gone crazy here too ? Why  
should we think *Origen* wrong here now with the mass of  
Greeks including all the cursives usually otherwise sympathetic  
to the **NB** recension as against these mss ?
- xiii. 43. **NB** *unc*<sup>14</sup> *rell* = εκλαμψουσιν, but D (*d* lucebunt) 124 238 *Cyr*  
*ORIGEN*<sup>ter</sup> and (*Justin*) have λαμψουσιν (*Justin* οταν οι μεν  
δικαιοι λαμψωσιν for τοτε οι δικ. λαμψουσιν). Hence if we  
want *Origen's* text with D, it is the uncompounded word (for  
which also *syr*† *copt* and *latt rell* “*fulgebant*” may also stand)  
which we need. Not a whisper in Westcott and Hort's text or  
margin of D *d Justin Cyr Orig*<sup>ter</sup> ! (To these add *Sod*<sup>3017</sup> *fam* φ<sup>a</sup>.)
- xiv. 22. Twice in this verse B opposes *Origen*, once specifically. B  
adds (with the versions) αυτου after τους μαθητας against *Orig*  
*diserte*, and writes πλοιον for το πλοιον against *Origen* and  
the mass.
36. +καν 1 22 33 *al.* *Origen* but μονον **NB** and the other Greeks.
- xv. 22. δεινωσ 1 [*non fam*] and *Orig* (*cf a* *sevissime*).  
κακωσ **NB** *unc omn rell minn*.
- xvi. 20. επιτιμησεν B\*D *syr cu d e* against the rest and *Orig*<sup>quater</sup>.  
*διστειλατο* and *Orig diserte* “ο μεν ουν μαθ. πεποιηκε κατα  
τινα των αντιγραφων το τοτε διστειλατο...ιστεον δε οτι τινα των  
αντιγρ. του κατα μαθ. εχει το επιτιμησεν” since he himself uses  
*διστειλατο* four times. Hort sees a necessity to put επιτιμησεν  
in his text.
- xvii. 22. συστρεφομενων δε αυτων **NB** 1 [*non fam*] 892 *W-H txt*, *Sod mg*  
*latt pl conversantibus*.  
*αναστρεφομενων δε αυτων* CD *rell omn et boh et re...ff<sub>1</sub> c e*.  
The “neutral” text is found in *Origen* στρεφομενων δε αυτων  
(*cf sah syr*).

† *Syr cu sin* vary ; *cu* “gleam,” *sin* “shine,” almost imperceptible difference in  
writing the syriac words.

Matt.

- (xviii. 10. I forbear to say anything about *Orig* and *Eus* + των εν τη εκκλησια after ορατε μη καταφρονησητε ενος των μικρων τουτων)  
 xx. 16. (See under "Coptic.")  
 xxi. 5. See under "Improvement."  
 6. See under "Improvement" συνεταξεν BCD 33 604 Evst 48 Sod<sup>1353</sup>  
 προσηταξεν  $\aleph$  *rell omn Orig<sup>ter</sup> Eus<sup>bis</sup>*  
 19. ου μηκετι BL<sup>7</sup> against  
 μηκετι  $\aleph$  *rell and Orig<sup>bis</sup>*  
 xxii. 4. ητοιμακα  $\aleph$ BCDLΣ<sup>17</sup> 1 22 33 892\* Sod<sup>1353</sup>  
 ητοιμασα *rell et Orig Cyr Dam*  
 10. ο νυμφων†  $\aleph$ BL 892 Sod<sup>190</sup> only (no other *min*),  
 ο γαμος *rell omn et Origen bis*  
 xxiii. 37. επισυναξαι *Orig Eus* (επισυναγειν  $\aleph$ , επισυναγαγειν B *rell*)  
 xxv. 41. οι καταραμενοι *Orig<sup>bis</sup> Hipp Const Eus Caes Bas* (καταραμενοι  
 $\aleph$ BL<sup>Tr</sup> 33 Sod<sup>1246</sup> boh Cyr 1/2 soli)  
 xxvi. 28. της καινης διαθηκης *Orig* and most (της διαθηκης  $\aleph$ BLZ 33 Sod<sup>050</sup>  
 boh<sup>unus</sup> Cyr (Cyp<sup>r</sup>))  
 39. Of our Lord's prayer: πατερ tantum *Orig<sup>sexies</sup> dis* (et *Celsus*) et  
*Justin Iren<sup>val</sup> Eus<sup>sexies</sup> Ath<sup>ter</sup> Ps-Ath Cypr Did Cyr Bas<sup>octies</sup> a*  
*δ μ vgg<sup>6</sup> et dim Orig<sup>int</sup> bis*, with LΔΣ *fam* 1 892 *al<sup>10</sup>*, witness  
 against πατερ μου of  $\aleph$ B and the rest.  
 In Westcott and Hort's margin there is not a sign of any  
 alternative to πατερ μου, and yet surely *Celsus*' and the  
*Valentinians*' "ω πατερ" deserves a hearing!  
 53. πλειω only  $\aleph$ BD (*latt*) against *Origen* πλειους with all the rest;  
*Soden* quotes *Orig* for πλειω.  
 δωδεκα (-η)  $\aleph$ BDL 604 b d against *Origen* η δωδεκα with all  
 the rest.  
 Above we have certainly two really "neutral" readings of  
*Origen*, as against  $\aleph$ B, xiii. 43 λαμψουσιν and xxvi. 39 πατερ.

Hort, vol i. p. 557: "On the other hand every combination of  $\aleph$  with another primary ms presents for the most part readings which cannot be finally approved..." But thereagainst note:

*Origen and  $\aleph$  against B.*

Matt.

- vi. 7. εθνικοι  $\aleph$  *omn et Orig* (contra B<sup>2</sup> *syr cu υποκριται*)  
 21. και η καρδια  $\aleph$  *omn et Orig* (contra B m *aeth boh<sup>unum</sup> - και*)  
 vii. 14 *init.* οτι (-δε)  $\aleph$ \*X m boh *Orig Naass etc* (οτι δε B sah 4/6)  
 x. 37. Habent και ο φιλων...μου αξιος  $\aleph$  *plur Orig Orig<sup>int</sup> Eus*  
*Cypr 2/3* (contra BD 17 243 *al<sup>sod</sup> d Cypr 1/3 om*)  
 xi. 15. Habent ακουειν  $\aleph$  *plur Docet Just Orig Orig<sup>int</sup>* (contra om BD  
 32 174 604 d k *syr sin*)

† Cf article under "Improvement" and sah *syr*.



Matt.

- xi. 21. *Habent καθημενοι* **NCU** 33 *al. Orig Orig<sup>int</sup> (contra om B plur sah boh syr lat)*
- xii. 49. *χειραν* **ND** *latt pl Orig Evang<sup>Ebion</sup> (+ αυτου B plur)*
- xiii. 4. *και ηλθεν τα πετεινα και κατεφαγεν* **ND** *plur Orig (και ελθοντα τα πετεινα κατεφ. B fam 13 Sod<sup>750</sup> aliq et txt)*
- { xv. 32. *ημερας τρεις* **N** *min Orig<sup>bis</sup> (τρεις ημερας B al.)*
- { xvii. 4. *τρεις σκηνας* **N** *plur Orig<sup>bis</sup> (σκηνας τρεις B e)*
- xvi. 1. *επηρωτων* **N** *min aliq boh Orig (επηρωτησαν BCD al.)*
14. *αλλοι δε* **N** *plur copt lat syr Orig (οι δε B Eus)*
20. *διεστειλατο* **N** *plur sah boh Orig<sup>quater</sup> (επετιμησεν BD)*
- xvii. 9. *αναστη* **N** *plur Orig (εγερθη BD Sod<sup>1353</sup>)*
10. *- αυτου* **NLWZ** *Sod<sup>750</sup> al. Orig (Habent B plur)*
25. *απο τωνων* **N** *plur Orig Cyr 2/4 (απο τωνος B Sod<sup>aliq</sup> Cyr 2/4)*
- xviii. 7. *Habent εστιν* **N** *plur Orig (om BLΣΦ al.)*
16. *δυο η τριων μαρτυρων* **N** *al. Orig (δυο μαρτ. η τριων B al.)*
- xx. 17. *τους δωδεκα tantum* **NDI, Z** *etc Orig<sup>quater</sup> (contra B et rell)*
- xxi. 6. *προσεταξευ* **N** *plur Orig<sup>ter</sup> (συνεταξευ BCD 33 604 Evst 48 Sod<sup>1353</sup>)*
8. *(sec loco) εστρωσαν* **ND<sup>57</sup> c e ff<sub>2</sub> q** *boh Orig (εστρωσαννουν B rell)*
19. *γενοιτο (for γενηται)* **N** *Sod<sup>750</sup> Orig<sup>ter</sup>*

*Etc etc*, and often 892 is on the side of **N** in the above list.

Further note that **NB** when they are in sympathy with the *Evang<sup>Ebion</sup>* do not keep on the same side. At xii. 48 B is with this Gospel. At xii. 49 it is **N**.

But see as to **N** in detail Part II. where the main differences between **N** and B are recorded with the supporting authorities.

## CHAPTER III.

### B IN ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

"Überblickt man in Grossen die Ergebnisse für Markus, so sind sie der Annahme, dass in ihm die älteste Aufzeichnung vorliegt, nicht günstig. Er ist dem Judentum entfremdet... Ausserdem ist Markus vielfach übermalt..."—Merx: *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, etc. II. Theil, II. Hälfte, p. 173.

"And what means are there to decide such questions? As long as scholars dream of one definite primitive Gospel, in open contradiction to Luke's proem, they will both raise and answer them; but as soon as that unwarranted supposition is removed we get rid of a host of inextricable questions."—Blass: *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 178/179.

I would like to preface what I have to say as to St. Mark's Gospel by the remark that all I have written should be included between two very large square brackets; for the problems offered in this Gospel are utterly different from those which exist in the other three. It is true that the same features as to **NBCL** exist to some extent in St. Mark as elsewhere, but they must be considered from a different point of view. One new feature is the constant addition of  $\Delta$  in St. Mark to the **NBL** group.  $\Delta$  in St. Mark is purely **NBL**; I cannot say "Egyptian" exactly, although there is Coptic sympathy with this group, because *W* comes in here to show us an absolutely different Greek recension existing in Egypt side by side with that of **NB**. Although *DW* are close, *W e* are twin brethren from Mark i.-iv. *fin* and it seems that I was perfectly right to speak of two or three Greek recensions in St. Mark.

Consider this: iv. 1.

**NBCL**:

καθησθαι εν τη θαλασση και πας ο οχλος προς την θαλασσαν επι  
της γης ησαν

*D*:

καθησται περαν της θαλασσης και πας ο οχλος περαν της θαλασσης ην  
*d* circa mare *a d l q* circa mare

*W*:

καθησθαι παρα τον αιγιαλον και πας ο οχλος εν τω αιγιαλω ην  
*b e* ad litus *b c e f ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>1</sub>* in litore  
*c ff<sub>2</sub>* proxime litus *Orig<sup>int</sup>* secus mare in terris  
*vg* circa mare super terram

As to *ην* (*pro ησαν*) *erat* is read by *a b g<sub>2</sub> l q vg Orig<sup>int</sup>*, *erant* by *d*, *stabat* is found in *f ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>1</sub>*, while *c* (*r*) reads *staret*, and it is left to *e* to write *sedebat*. As *W* does not conform to this last, we must suppose that *W* was not deliberately following our *e*, but something much older, and note *b* has *erat* and *d* has *erant*.

How is it that neither 2<sup>pe</sup> nor 604 have any relation to *W* and the

Latins here? All the Old Latin and Coptic elide *ἐπι της γης* or include it in the expression *in litore*. It is left for W alone to graecize this.

Right after this, the common base of W *b c e* apart from the rest and apart from D *d* omit in iv. 5 *δια το μη εχειν βαθος γης*.

That the Greek of W is an independent translation is seen at iv. 20, for W alone writes *το εν (ter)* for *εν*.† And at iv. 21 *καιεται* for *ερχεται*, where D has *απτεται*, which can be read in two ways. Otherwise we might think that *e* obtained *damus* from the *δωμεν* of W (iv. 30, others *θωμεν* or *παραβαλωμεν*), or that *b e* got *crescit* from *αυξει* of W (iv. 32, others *αναβαινει*), instead of W obtaining this Greek via the Latin.

An interesting point is the doubling of *puella* by *e* in v. 41, but W with the rest *το κορασιον*, so that *e* obtained this *later* than the time of W, and Aphraates' remarks on this subject appear to be the merest tradition. This is helpful as to dates.

W<sup>d</sup> (which breaks in at vii. 33) seems further to be *another* independent translation.

### MARK.

In Mark we must be exceedingly careful and avail ourselves of every scrap of new evidence. I will therefore recapitulate the position as to several important witnesses.

*k* only begins at viii. 8, but *e* is available for i. 20–vi. 9 (again only at xii. 37–xiii. 3, xiii. 24–27, 33–36) and *r*<sub>2</sub> fills in the gap between *e* and *k* from vi. 13–viii. 8.

Σ gives us all Mark to xvi. 14 middle; Φ i. 1–xiv. 62; Ψ only from ix. 6 (shortly after *k* begins) to end. Paris<sup>97</sup> and 604 and 2<sup>pe</sup> give us all St. Mark. *Syr sin* begins at i. 12/13 and gives all St. Mark to xvi. 8 except i. 44–ii. 21, iv. 18–41 and v. 26–vi. 5. Nothing of *Syr cu* survives except xvi. 17–20, which is interesting as giving part of the portion at the end after xvi. 8. Finally we have the inestimable new witness W, which gives us all St. Mark (except xv. 12–38) including xvi. 9–20 with a long addition therein.

We have also Horner's completed labours on *sah* and *boh*.

The Palestinian syriac replaces *syr cu sin* at i. 1–12 and in the ii<sup>nd</sup> and v<sup>th</sup> chapters, but not in the iv<sup>th</sup>.

The cursives Laura<sup>A 104</sup> and Paris<sup>97</sup> I continue to quote thus as Gregory's and Scrivener's numbers differ. I have also used by number 892‡ collated by Rendel Harris in 1890, as this number is the same in

† Consider also *οποταν* W alone at iv. 31 for *ος οταν* (*οταν* N\*) or *ο οτι αν* D. Note the absolute independence of W at iii. 3 *εκ του μεσου* for *εις το μεσον* (*a b d e f ff<sub>2</sub> q δ* in medium) or *εν μεσω* D<sup>gr</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> (*c l vgKZ* in medio). Also *ειδον* W<sup>so1</sup> at ii. 12 (for *ειδομεν*) = *viderunt* of *c* (*b*) (*vidisse se a q*) while *e* has *vidimus*. So that here *b c W* are either basic or the reverse. Which? N seeks to improve by substituting alone *εφανη εν τω ισραηλ*.

‡ = *Sod*<sup>101d</sup>. Apparently not used by Souter, but it seems even closer to NB than Paris<sup>97</sup>.

Gregory and Scrivener-Miller, and it has much affinity with  $\aleph$ B and is useful before chapter ix where  $\Psi$  begins.

*Example of Editing by B.*

Mark

xiii. 33. — *και προσευχεσθε* BD 122 *a c d k vg*<sup>1\*</sup> *W-H soli contra mundum.*

I wish to point out that *k* does not strengthen here because we catch *k* (alone among Latins) going with B two verses further on (xiii. 35) in a question of "pairs." Besides, why are  $\aleph$  and L absent; why do 604 892 and Paris<sup>97</sup> withhold their support? And where are the Coptic and the Syriac versions, which scholars tell me merely share the *base* of B? Not even 2<sup>pc</sup> joins BD here. And W abstains with 28 and 157, *fam* 1 and *fam* 13. [*Von Soden* adds no fresh Greeks, not even  $\delta$  30 or 050.]

*Solecisms of B.*

Mark

- |              |  |                   |  |
|--------------|--|-------------------|--|
| i. 18.       | <i>ηκολουθουν</i> ( <i>pro ηκολουθησαν</i> ) | B <sup>sol</sup>  | (See under Historic present)   |
| 26.          | <i>το ακαθαρτον</i> (— <i>το πνευμα</i> )    | B <sup>sol</sup>  | Observe <i>e r το πνευμα</i> (— <i>το ακαθαρτον</i> ) while W omits the whole. |
| 36.          | — <i>οι</i>                                  | B <sup>*sol</sup> |  |
| 40.          | <i>κυριε οτι</i>                             | B <sup>sol</sup>  | ( <i>sah boh οτι κυριε, sed al. vel om κυριε vel οτι vel ambas lectt</i> )     |
| <i>ibid.</i> | <i>δυνη</i> ( <i>pro δυνασαι</i> )           | B <sup>sol</sup>  | Why not <i>δυνα</i> ? [See ix. 22, 23.]  |
| 45.          | — <i>ην</i>                                  | B <sup>sol</sup>  | (— <i>ην και b e soli inter verss</i> )  |
- These three points occurring thus together after an interval of two chapters are absolutely indicative of editing. The central one shows *boh* influence and the sympathy of two Latins.
- |              |                           |                  |  |
|--------------|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| iii. 34      | <i>init.</i> — <i>και</i> | B <sup>sol</sup> |  |
| 35.          | — <i>γαρ</i>              | B <i>boh b e</i> |  |
| <i>ibid.</i> | <i>τα θεληματα</i>        | B <sup>*ol</sup> |  |
- iv. 5. *και οπου* B<sup>sol</sup> (*a* ?) The others have *οπου*, or *και οτι* DW *it*<sup>pl</sup>. It looks like a kind of "conflate" here in this "neutral" text. Hort prints [*και*] *οπου*, quite disguising the real situation.
- ibid* *βαθος της γης* (*pro βαθος γης*) B<sup>sol</sup> *cum Sod*<sup>050</sup> [*ut B<sup>sol</sup> in Matt. xiii. 5*]. D<sup>sr</sup> alone agrees to insert an article *βαθος την γην*.  $\aleph$  and all the rest against them. [W and its faithful allies *b e e* omit the clause.] The *addition* of the article alone by BD looks like translation from Latin.
- |     |  |                  |   |
|-----|--|------------------|---|
| 11. | <i>εξωθεν</i> ( <i>pro εξω</i> )       | BΣ <sup>1</sup>  | ( <i>contra rell et Orig</i> <sup>bis</sup> ) |
| 15. | <i>οι οταν</i> ( <i>pro και οταν</i> ) | B <sup>sol</sup> | ( <i>cf pers</i> )                            |
| 16. | <i>οταν</i> ( <i>pro οι οταν</i> )     | B <sup>sol</sup> |   |
| 20. | — <i>εν sec et tert</i>                | B <sup>sol</sup> | <i>et 1 (cf syr)</i>                          |
| 22  | <i>fin.</i> <i>φανερωθη</i>            | B <sup>sol</sup> | ( <i>cf syr sah pers aeth</i> )               |
| 28. | <i>πληρες σειτος</i>                   | B                | (DW <i>πληρης ο σειτος</i> )                  |
| 32. | <i>κατασκηνοιν</i>                     | B                |   |

Mark

- v. 36. + τον (ante λαλουμενον) 'τον λογον τον λαλουμενον B<sup>sol</sup>  
 38 *fin.* πολλας (pro πολλα) B<sup>sol</sup> (πολλους Sod<sup>050</sup>)
- vi. 17. - την γυναικα B\* *txt sol cum* Sod<sup>1493</sup>  
 33. εγνωσαν BD *fam* 1  
 39. εν (pro επι) B<sup>sol</sup>  
 54 *init.* και εξελθοντων (- αυτων) B<sup>ol</sup>
- vii. 4. απερ ελαβον (pro a παρελαβον) B Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>1442</sup>  
 14. λεγει (pro ελεγει) B 59 *sol*i (see under "Historic present")  
 15.† το κοιουν αυτον (pro ο δυναται αυτον κοιωσαι) B<sup>sol</sup> (*cf Aug*)  
*ibid fin.* - τον (ante ανθρωπον) B<sup>sol</sup> *vid* (against sah; this is to be noted because boh acts peculiarly in verse 15, and it is with boh [non sah] that NBLΔ omit the verse 16 following).  
 24. εκειθε (pro εκειθεν) B. This is a "nicety" before δε.  
 37. + ως (post πεποιηκεν) B. See under "Coptic."
- viii. 2. ημεραις τρισι B<sup>sol</sup> *cum* 892 (Harris, Journ. Bib. Lit. 1890, vol. ix.)  
 12. - υμιν BL, no others, no versions, not Origen.  
 But W omits both λεγω and υμιν, having only αμην.  
 32. > ο πετρος αυτον BL *a soli* W-H Sod (*sed cf sah boh*). There is no good reason for the change by BL: και προσλαβομενος ο πετρος αυτον ηρξατο instead of και προσλ. αυτον ο πετρος ηρξατο.  
 37. + ο (ante ανθρωπος) B<sup>sol</sup>. See under "Coptic."
- ix. 1. ωδε των εστηκοτων B(D\*), *cf c f l vg* [contra N, contra Orig]  
 21. εως B<sup>sol</sup> (εως ου Sod<sup>351</sup>)
- x. 30. ζων αιωνιαν (pro ζων αιωνιον) B<sup>sol</sup>. Here is a purist for you. No others seem to change. Clem turns it "ζωή ἐστιν αἰώνιος," Q.D.S. § 25, but Barnard in his note to 'Clem. of Alex. Bibl. Text,' p. 35 = ζωή ἐστιν αἰώνιος.  
 39. δυνομεθα (pro δυναμεθα) B<sup>sol</sup> *vid*  
 48. αυτοι πολλοι (pro αυτω vel αυτον πολλοι) B<sup>ol</sup>. *Cf Orig αυτω οι πολλοι* and sah
- xi. 1. βηδφαγη B<sup>sol</sup> (*cf sah* 1/5)  
*ibid.* το ελαιων (pro των ελαιων) B<sup>sol</sup> (*cf Σ et k*)  
 7, 8. εαυτων *bis*† B<sup>sol</sup> *cum* 892 (*vide infra* xiii. 44) (Sod<sup>050</sup> 1279<sup>2</sup>)  
 11. - της ωρας B<sup>sol</sup> *cum* 1 Sod<sup>167</sup> 413 1444 (*cf aeth syr sin*)
- xii. 5. αποκτενουντες B 892 *Evst* 150  
 8. εξεβαλαν B<sup>ol</sup>  
 17. - αυτοις BD *d* [non al.]  
 36. - εν (ante τω πνευματι) B<sup>sol</sup> *cum* Sod<sup>050</sup> 273  
*ibid.* καθισον (pro καθου) B<sup>sol</sup>

† This hardly seems a change "guiltless of ingenuity or other untimely activity of the brain and unaffected by mental influences except of the most limited and unconscious kind" (Hort) for in vv. 13/15 B opposes N *eight times*!

‡ See page 11 as to this Alexandrian preference.

Mark

- xii. 40. κατεσθοντες B Cf *Luc* vii. 33  
 xiii. 3. καθιδιαν B  
 7. ακουητε B et *Sod*<sup>1337</sup>  
 9. ενεκα (pro ενεκεν) B<sup>sol</sup> vid  
 12. επαναστησεται B<sup>sol</sup> cum *Sod*<sup>3017</sup> k (cf BΔ *Matt.* x. 21 in loco  
 parall.)  
 13. εις στελος B<sup>sol</sup>  
 30. εως ουτου B<sup>sol</sup> (variant plurimum *rell.*,  
*vide Part II.*)  
 32. αγγελος (pro οι αγγελοι) B<sup>sol</sup> (et *boh*<sup>1</sup> *quinque Aug*<sup>libere</sup>)  
 34. εαυτου pr et sec (pro αυτου) B<sup>sol</sup> vid (*vide supra* xi. 7, 8  
 xiv. 20 *fin.* + εν (*inter το et τυμβλιον*) B<sup>sol</sup> (C\* ??) *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> See  
 under "Coptic."  
 24. — αυτοις B<sup>sol</sup>  
 32. — ωδε B<sup>sol</sup> (αυτου pro ωδε *fam* 1)  
 43. απο των αρχ. (pro παρα των αρχ.) B<sup>sol</sup>  
 49. εκρατει (pro εκρατησατε) B<sup>sol</sup> (εκρατειτε Ψ)  
 60. οτι (pro τι) BWΨ *sol*i (cf *boh*) (τοι 13)  
 63. κιτωνας B<sup>sol</sup> (ut *N alibi*)  
 69. ειπεν (pro ηρξατο λεγειν) B<sup>sol</sup>. See under "Coptic."  
 xv. 4. — ουδεν B Paris<sup>97</sup> *sol*i vid  
 12. ποιησω λεγετε (pro θελετε ποιησω ον λεγετε) B<sup>sol</sup> et *W-H* [ον]  
 15. ποιειν (pro ποιησαι) B<sup>sol</sup> cum *Laura*<sup>A104</sup>  
 35. εστηκοτων B<sup>sol</sup>(A) (pro παρεστωτων *N*DU *al. pauc.*,  
*παρεστηκοτων al.*)  
 45. ιωση (pro ιωσηφ) BW *sol*i  
 xvi. 5. ελθουσαι (pro εισελθουσαι) B 127 *sol*i

## B and Latin Sympathy.

It continues to be impossible to divorce B from the Latin and to treat its text as "neutral."

Consult Mark xiv. 30 με απαρηνηση (pro απαρηνηση με) *NBDAC* (*fam* 13) (με αρνηση W) and latt (*W-H Sod*). All others and Ψ have the common order. The point being that B is supported by both the graeco-latins DΔ (L 69\* *Sod*<sup>050</sup> and k\* alone omit με, evidently seeing in their copies the two orders). In this case, by Hort's canons, L 69 *Sod*<sup>050</sup> and k would represent the "true" "neutral" shorter text against B. But this is very unlikely, as με is required in this sentence.

In xiv. 72 the same order occurs in *NBCLWΔΨ* Old Latins and *copt* (*W-H Sod*).

As bearing on this in the immediate context note Mark xv. 1, where *BDLΨ* *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 46 2<sup>pe</sup> 892 *Sod*<sup>1337</sup> omit επι το before πρωι, agreeing exactly with the Latin *mane*. Again here D supports (so *W-H txt*, not *Sod*).

In the same neighbourhood, Mark xv. 32 **ΣBΔΚΛΔΠ** (*W-H Sod*) omit *του* before *ισραηλ*. Here we have conjunction **BΔ** once more with the Latin. *W* is wanting but 28 157 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> do not omit.

Again xv. 30 for *και καταβα* of Greek and Syr we find *καταβας* by **ΣBD<sup>sr</sup>ΔΨ** *Sod*<sup>950</sup> and *k l n vg copt* (*W-H Sod*).

Again xv. 27 for *σταυρουσιν* of the usual text we find *εσταυρωσαν* by **B** 2<sup>pe</sup> agreeing with *c d ff2 k n* not followed by *W-H* or *Sod*.

Incidentally we may ask why **BDW** and *c<sup>scr</sup> Sod*<sup>1442</sup> are found alone in conjunction at xv. 44 with *ηδη* for *παλαι*. Is this small group *really* "neutral" here against all else? If so it is a graeco-latin (*jam . . . jam*). Hort has it in his text, so that it must be "neutral" as well!

Referring to *k*'s omission in xiv. 30, we find another case at xv. 8, where there are two very different readings to choose from, *αβαβας* (of **ΣBD** 892 *sah boh goth* (*a*) *c d ff2 l r δ vg*) and *αβαβουσας* (of the great majority of Greeks, of the *syriac*, of *arm* and of *diatess<sup>arab</sup>*). *b e f i q* are wanting, but *δ* writes *ascendisset* over *αβαβουσας*. *Aeth* conflates both readings.

We know then that in *k*'s time *both* readings must have been extant—as *k* omits—and *B* chose (siding with **ΣD** on the *Latin* side).

It is quite noteworthy that *B* goes with the *Egyptian* versions here, besides the Latin, *against* the *syriacs* and the *diatessaron*, and against **Σ<sup>ob</sup>A** fifteen uncials and *W* and all the cursives including *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 and 157 435 and 2<sup>pe</sup> 604.

This is a very remarkable place and merits more attention in these discussions than it has hitherto received. The new uncial *W* with **Σ** (*Φ* wanting) **Ψ** and the notable cursives Paris<sup>97</sup> and Laura<sup>A</sup> 104 with all Soden's other codices go with the mass of Greeks for *αβαβουσας* against **ΣBD** 892 *latt*, while the Latin here is hopelessly opposed to the *Syriac* and to its great friend the *diatessaron*. Further observe extraordinary unanimity here among the Latins (the Latin *diatessaron vg<sup>F</sup>* is confused here and leaves out Mark xv. 8). *Sod* follows *Hort* with *αβαβας*.

Jebb refers to a similar case in the Old Testament as regards *αβεβησεν* and *αβαβουσεν* 2 Kings xxiii. 9.

For further detail, observe the following :

- Mark i. 2. —*εγω* BD *Sod*<sup>950</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> *latt*  
 10. *εις αυτον* (*pro επ αυτον*) BD *fam* 13 *a d l* and *vg* in  
*ipso*, *b* in *eo*, against all the rest and the sympathising cursives. *W* seems to have changed *εic* to *επ* at the time it was written. *Sod* follows *Hort* for *εις*.  
 iv. 1. *οχλος πλειστος pro οχλος πολυς* **ΣBCLΔ** and only these *plus*  
*W* 892 *W-H Sod*. Possibly from an original *turba multa multa* (this redupl. is quite common), but *cf. Matt* xiii. 2 at the parallel where *πας ο οχλος* is used. *πλειστος* is unusual, occurring only in the Gospels at *Matt*. xi. 20 *αι πλεισται δυναμεις αυτου* and *Matt*. xxi. 8 *ο δε πλειστος οχλος*. As *W* joins exceptionally





Mark

xv. 44.  $\eta\delta\eta$  (*pro παλαι*) *sec loco* BDW  $c^{scr}$  *Sod*<sup>1442</sup> *solī vid.* This corresponds to the *jam...jam* of the Latins.

W goes as far as to repeat the  $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$  in the second place for  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$  of nearly all. D says  $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$  (*syr sin* omits  $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota$ , and 2<sup>pe</sup> *n r<sub>2</sub>* omit the clause).

xvi. 2. —  $\tau\eta$  (*ante μια*) BW 1 *solī et [W-H]*. Cf *latt una vel prima*. Soden holds  $\tau\eta\varsigma$  *μιας*, but his notes are confusing in the extreme.

*As to Coptic.*

Mark

- i. 4.  $\kappa\eta\rho\nu\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$  (—  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ) B 33 73 892 *W-H sah boh*<sup>duo</sup> [*non al.*]  
 34.  $\tau\alpha$  *δαιμονια λαλειν* B<sup>sol</sup> *vid cum boh (hiat sah)*. The others have *λαλειν τα δαιμονια*, but D *d latt syr sin aeth*: *αυτα λαλειν* in the order of B, but more simply.  
 37.  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  *ευρον αυτον και λεγουσιν* NBL 892 *solī et W-H cum e boh*<sup>Δ108</sup> *aeth*

This is a very noteworthy place. All the sympathising cursives oppose and with the bulk of the uncials and *boh*<sup>pl</sup> have *και ευροντες αυτον λεγ.*, or as D *lat syr arm goth sah και οτε ευρον αυτον λεγ.* Tisch records *b c* for “*nil nisi dicentes.*” To these two Old Latin witnesses add the new *W<sup>scr</sup>*, and it will be seen that NBL 892 *e* are left completely alone with *boh*<sup>Δ108</sup> and *aeth*.

To insist that these *boh* codices and *aeth* got it from NBL is to do violence to the other passages witnessing to quite the contrary course.† A curious and innate sympathy then remains here between these three *boh* codices *aeth* and NBL *e*, while W breaks loose from *e* here, and with *b c* gives us much the shortest text.

- i. 39.  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$  (*pro ην*) NBL *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 892 *sah boh aeth W-H Sod* against all else and *syr latt arm goth*. The “*erat praedicans*” is not very pretty in Latin, and yet the Latins held it. I am convinced that  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$  is sheer improvement by NBL. Even 33 and Paris<sup>97</sup> desert them, and they had upheld them in two violent changes in verse 38. Why on earth should “Antioch” have substituted *ην* for  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ ? N goes further and after  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$  substitutes  $\kappa\eta\rho\nu\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$  for  $\kappa\eta\rho\nu\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$  with *boh*.  
 ii. 1. —  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  (*ante ηκουσθη*) NBL 28 33 124 [*non fam*] 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> *W-H Sod. a c sah boh arm*.  
 2. —  $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  NBLW 33 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> 892 *W-H (non Sod)* *b g<sub>2</sub> l r<sub>2</sub> vg sah boh arm aeth syr*<sup>sch</sup> (*contra D rell qui saepe in ch. i ευθεως om.*)

† For consider *aeth* at i. 34 where *aeth* goes with *syr sin* D *d* and all Latins; at i. 11 where it goes with *a* (*f goth*); at i. 15 with *syr pesh*; at i. 21 where it steers its own course; at i. 29 with Σ; at i. 38 with *syr sin*.

Mark

- ii. 4. προσενεγκαι NBL *Sod*<sup>050</sup> (33) 63 253 372 892 *Eust* 48 f l vg (offerre contra accedere it) sah boh aeth. This is an important place. D with the rest and it syr has προσεγγισαι (a few εγγισαι) and W προσελθειν. As to 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> they contradict flatly NBL *copt* and have προσεγγισαι. W seems to be retranslating *accedere* of the Old Latin. *Sod* refuses προσενεγκαι.  
 7 init. οτι (pro τι) B *Sod*<sup>050</sup> p<sup>scr</sup> only. Cf οτι τι of sah boh with the usual introductory χε. Also syr. [But see ix. 11, 28.]  
 16. και (οι) γραμματεϊς των φαρισαιων (pro και οι γραμ. και οι φαρ.) read by NBLΔW 33 28 124 (against the rest) b *copt* (not syr)

The points which particularly appeal to me in such passages are the opposition in the *fam* 13 group and the *absence* of such controlling mss as *fam* 1 157 2<sup>pe</sup> [*Soden* quotes 93<sup>f</sup>??] 604 892 Paris<sup>97</sup>.

Here, where Tisch. quotes *copt* ("ita certe cop<sup>cod</sup> cop<sup>edd</sup> et dz ") we must correct from Horner. *Sah* reads και οι φαρ. (i.e. "with the pharisees ") and only the boh mss Δ<sub>1</sub>F\*?O are reported for των φαρ. This is important. For if while considering Egyptian or Alexandrian influence on NB we are likely to be held up and the point made that NB influenced the coptic versions instead of vice versa, we point to a passage like this where the Egyptian versions *refused* to be influenced ; at any rate a trace remains only in two bohairic mss and possibly in the first hand of a third.

- ii. 17. + οτι (ante ου χρειαν) BΔ *Sod*<sup>050</sup> δ 2<sup>pe</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>351</sup> sah boh. Absolutely no others yet greedily seized by *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> [*W-H*<sup>txt</sup>]. This is noteworthy for it is followed five words further by :

*ibid.* αλλα (pro αλλ') BW *solicum* sah boh (*more copt*), refused by *Sod*.

18. οι δε σοι (-μαθηται) B *sol cum* 127 2<sup>pe</sup> boh<sup>pl</sup>, refused by *Sod*.

This therefore establishes an absolute relationship between B and coptic (= boh<sup>vid</sup>) in vv. 17 and 18.

22. απολλυται και οι ασκοι B 892<sup>vid</sup> only, and so exactly boh. No others, but accepted by *W-H Sod*. This among a very complicated number of changes in the account of the wine and bottles is most striking, coming right after the minutiae noticed above.

- iii. 6. εδιδουν pro εποιουν BL *fam* 13 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *Sod*<sup>243</sup> only with boh<sup>p1.2.4.210</sup>, adopted by *W-H* and *Soden*.

This is interesting (and cannot be classed beyond under "Synonyms") because the syriac can lend itself to either interpretation and is indeterminate (rendered *ceperunt* by syr<sup>int</sup>). I hardly think it is fair to suggest that εδιδουν is "neutral" ; rather is it a correction. Notice that N is absent, reading with CΔ *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> εποιησαν. The latins and d use *faciebant* (q iniebant). Paris<sup>97</sup> εποιουν with most. D<sup>sr</sup> α ποιουντες. W *Sod*<sup>1222</sup> εποιουντο. As to the coptic, notice Δ<sub>1</sub>O again come in for εδιδουν as they did above for των φαρισαιων (ii. 16).

892\* is uncertain with εποιησαν in the margin.

Mark

- iii. 8. *ποιει* (*pro epioiei*) BL *W-H* (none of the sympathising cursives) and *sah boh*<sup>quinque</sup> against **ND** and the rest + **WΣΦ**.  
 15. — *θεραπευειν τας νοσους και* **NBC\*LΔ** 892 2<sup>pe</sup> *sah boh*, against all else [none of the other sympathising cursives nor Latin nor Syriac nor Arm. nor Goth] yet followed by *T Tr W-H Rev* and *Soden txt*. Observe *aeth* which evidently put the clause in after considerable research, for *aeth* adds it *after* *εκβαλλειν τα δαιμονια* instead of before the clause. This is not necessarily *ex Matt x. 1*.

The community of Egyptian origin for **NBLΔ** is hereby set forth, and the “neutral” text transferred bodily to Alexandria, and I claim that the “neutral” text is part of a revision by the Alexandrian School and not a survival of Apostolic days. Here **NBC\*LΔ** are supported not by a single Greek cursive [except 2<sup>pe</sup> (against 604) 892], not by any syriac or arm., not by any Latin, but by *all* the MSS of the *sah* and *boh* which we know.

In *boh* I may point out that there might be confusion and exclusion from similarity of appearance between *ϣωπι*, and *ϣωπι* (*infirmus*). See Horner's note in *boh* as to addition by codd. F<sup>c</sup>G<sup>c</sup>.

The new Codex W<sup>sr</sup> does *not* omit, and adds after *δαιμονια* end of verse *και περιαγοντες κηρυσσιν το ευαγγελιον*. The place, folio 319, is worth study, for no *στιχος* space is found between *νοσους* and *και εκβαλλειν*, while there is one between *δαιμονια* and the addition.

35. — *γαρ* B b e *boh et W-H txt* [*non Sod*]  
 iv. 21. + *οτι* (*ante μητι*) BL 892 *solī = copt* + **ΣΕ**. Accepted by *W-H*, refused by *Sod*.

*Fam* 13 and 28 add *ιδετε*. The rest all omit.

The sentence runs: *και ελεγεν αυτοις [οτι] μητι ερχεται (απτεται D latt) ο λυχνος ινα υπο του μοδιου τεθη*.

Is it possible to imagine that BL preserve the original and that *all* others, including the other important sympathising cursives, have dropped it? More likely again BL show Egyptian or Alexandrian minds or eyes at work.

- iv. 34. *και χωρις* (*pro χωρις δε*) BΦΔ 604 (*solī inter gr-lat*) *cum sah syr pesh aeth boh*<sup>pl</sup> but refused by both *W-H* and *Sod*.  
 v. 42. *και εξεστησαν + ευθυσ* **NBCLΔ** 33 892 [*non al. min*] *boh aeth W-H Sod txt* [*contra DW rell et latt sah syr*].  
 vi. 2. + *οι* (*ante πολλοι*) BL *fam* 13 [*non* 124] 28 [*non W*] 892<sup>vid</sup> *sah boh*<sup>quattuor</sup> (*syr emph*) *W-H Sod txt* [*Non Paris*<sup>97</sup> *non Σ*].

Very strange if this *οι* should have been cut out of all other texts, including **Σ** [**Ψ** does not begin until ch. ix].

8. > *μη αρτον μη πηραν* **NBCLΔ** *Sod*<sup>1050 al 3</sup> 33 892 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *boh* [*non sah*] *aeth W-H Sod* [*contra W et D et rell omn et sah et minn rell omn*].

Mark

- vi. 9. This is instantly followed by *αλλα* for *αλλ'* (before *υποδεδεμενους*, forming a hiatus) *ex more copt* by **NABCDLUNΣ** 28 scr<sup>2</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup>, but W is careful to write *αλλ'* and insert an apostrophe!
11. This is again shortly afterwards followed by a pure coptic form. For observe that coptic is always precise. It does not say *ubi* or *quo* but always *in loco quo*. So here:

*ος αν τοπος μη δεξεται* **NBLΔ**<sup>sr</sup>W *fam* 13 28 *W-H Sod* is found in *boh* (*sah*) *aeth vg<sup>L</sup>*, while the others have: *ος αν μη δεξεται* C (*fam* 1) and AD and the large majority *οσοι αν μη δεξονται*, *latt etc.* W here apparently shares the bohairic influence against the Latins, but as *e* is missing now we cannot be sure that it did not have it. A Latin trace remains in *vg<sup>L</sup>* only, *r<sub>2</sub>* is missing and only begins again at vi. 14.

20. *-και (ante συνετηει)* **B**<sup>sol</sup> *cum sah* 1/3 (= *sah*<sup>74</sup>)

The previous places have all considerable importance and should be observed carefully for they lead up to:

- vi. 20. *ηπορει (pro επορει)* **NBL** *Sod*<sup>950</sup> (and W *ηπορειτο*) *sah boh*, against all the rest, against the friendly cursives, and against *latt syrr* and *aeth* yet willingly incorporated by *W-H & Sod* texts.

The Semitic *πολλα επορει* appears to have offended the early Alexandrian recensers of Greek and Coptic texts. But this clear coptic adherence against all else destroys "neutrality" for **NBL** and for W here.† See also the parallel in Luke.

Mark

- vi. 27. *ενεγκαι (pro ενεχθηναι)* **NBCΔ**<sup>sr</sup> 892 *copt W-H [non Sod]* against all else and DW as well as L and *Latt adferri*. (See under "Change of voice"). *δ* over *Δ*<sup>sr</sup> has "*adferri vel adduci.*"
40. *κατα bis (pro ανα bis)* **NBD** 21 *boh et W-H Sod txt.*
- vii. 4. *ραντισωνται (pro βαπτισωνται)* **NB** *min*<sup>8</sup> *sah Euthym.* See under "Improvement."
6. *+οτι (ante ουτος ο λαος)* **NBL** 372 892 *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *boh sah (syrr) W-H Sod txt [non Paris<sup>97</sup>]*
16. *Om vers boh [non sah] cum* **NBLΔ** 28 [*non W rell*] *W-H, non Sod.*
29. See under "Order."
37. *+ως post πεποιηκεν* **B**<sup>sol</sup> *W-H*<sup>mg</sup> (*boh*), *ef sah + ζωκτη et boh*<sup>aliq</sup>
- viii. 2. *προσμενουσι (-μοι)* **B**<sup>sol</sup> *cum boh*<sup>codd</sup> *tribus* (*Cf latt ωδε εισω*)
- 3 *fin. εισιν (pro ηκασιν vel ηκουσιν)* **BLΔ**<sup>sr</sup> 892 *sah* 1/5 *boh*<sup>quattuor</sup>
- W-H [non Sod, non al. nec latt syrr]*
4. *+οτι (ante ποθεν)* **BLΔ** 115 892 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *sah boh [non al.] W-H & Sod.†*

† It is exceedingly important to distinguish and appreciate this *overlying* coptic influence on W. I have observed that soon after the beginning of ch. v. W began to drift away from *e*. Since vi. 8 *e* is missing, but we have seen above (vi. 11) the same overlying Egyptian influence on W. Probably from v. onwards W used another graeco-coptic ms.

† Observe *Soden's* thoroughly Alexandrian mind, adopting this but refusing the same group above.

Mark

In view of varying treatment here by others (see *Tisch* and evidence) this seems purely "Egyptian."

viii. 9 — *οι φαγοντες* (See under "Improvement.")

20. + *αυτω* (*ante επτα fin*) BCLΔ 892 *Sod*<sup>107 1089</sup> [*non txt*] *boh sah aeth*

21. *νοειτε* (*pro συνιετε*) B 372 *Sod*<sup>1098 1225 1341</sup> *sed D*<sup>gr\*</sup> *συννοειτε*

This is rather a curious place. At first sight it looks simply harmonistic from *Matt* xvi. 11 where *νοειτε* is used, but the *συννοειτε* of *D*<sup>gr</sup> may be meant for *ουν νοειτε*, and *ουν* is present in some Greeks (*fam* 13) and in *sah*, but there it is *σε* not *ουν* as it would be in *boh* if present there, where it does not find a place. The *boh* word for *συνιετε* is *τετενα†τι* but in *sah* = *πτετπνοει*. It seems clear therefore that B may have *seen* this *νοει* in a close parallel column and written *νοειτε* by mistake rather than have recollected or borrowed from *St. Matthew*.

Mark

viii. 23. *βλεπεις* (*pro βλεπει*) BCD<sup>gr</sup>Δ<sup>gr</sup> *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 372 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *sah boh aeth* (strengthened by *syr sin diatess*) but against all else.

W writes *βλεπει*, and 28 after hesitating (and doubtless consulting his authorities) decides to do likewise; so does *Sod txt* against *W-H*.

viii. 28. + *οτι* (*ante ιωαννην*) NB *copt* (*ut solet*) (*syr*) *et W-H txt* *contra rell et latt omn*. Clearly from *copt* yet *Sod txt* has [*οτι*].

*ibid.* + *οτι* (*ante eis*) NBC\*L 892 *copt* (*ut solet*) (*syr*) *W-H Sod txt* (*latt pl quasi unum, ως ενα D, sed Gr<sup>pl</sup> et W ενα tantum*).

35. *την εαυτου ψυχην* (*pro την ψυχην αυτου prim*) B 28 *copt* (*ut solet*) *Orig W-H txt*. No others.

37. + *ο* (*ante ανθρωπος*) B<sup>sol</sup> *cum sah et boh*. Why do *W-H* avoid?

x. 1. + *και* (*ante περαν*) NBC\*LΨ 892 *sah boh* (against *περαν* others and latin, and *δια του περαν* others, *και δια του περαν Laura*<sup>A104</sup>). So *W-H*, and *Sod* in square brackets. Latter omits *copt*.

6. — *ο θεος* NBCLΔ [*non Ψ*] *Sod*<sup>309</sup> *c δ* [*non ff<sub>2</sub> male Sod.*] *sah boh W-H* [*non al. latt gr non syr arm aeth*] *cf Matt xix*.

24. — *τους πεποιθотas επι (τοις) χρημασιν* NBWΔΨ *k sah boh*<sup>sex</sup> (*aeth*) [*contra rell syr sin et Clem<sup>dis</sup>*] *Cf Merx ad loc. p. 122 seq.*

26. *λεγοντες προς αυτον* (*pro λεγ. προς εαυτους*) NBCΔΨ 892 *Sod*<sup>1341</sup> *δ sah boh W-H, non Sod* [*contra rell et W et latt syr aeth arm goth (om πρ. αυτ. Clem ut Matt Luc)*]

As *Tisch* says "at nusquam apud Mc *λεγειν προς τινα*." He accordingly retains *προς εαυτους* in his text. Not so *W-H*, who of course follow the little "Egyptian" (not "neutral") group. Souter's *R-V* also leaves *αυτον* in the text, but places *εαυτους* in the sub-margin.

x. 29. > *η μητερα η πατερα* BCD *et WΦ* [*non Ψ*] *Sod*<sup>050</sup>, 61 106 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *Sod*<sup>quinque</sup> only of minuscules, *c f q* only of Latins, with *sah boh* order against the rest and *Orig<sup>dis</sup>*, but followed by *Sod txt*.

35. *οι δυο υιοι* (*pro υιοι vel οι υιοι*) BC Paris<sup>97</sup> *sol cum sah boh aeth*.

This is against **ND** *rell omn vid* and **WΦΨ** and *Orig* with *syr lat arm*. It is a clear improvisation from the account in **Matthew** (xx. 20 *seq*) where the mother comes, but it does not say there "with her two sons" † but in verse 21 only does she ask "*that* her two sons..." **B** is convicted here of running with a coptic error against **N** and *Orig*. How many more instances of this kind must I adduce before the worshippers of **B** and the obsequious slaves of **Hort** will allow that I am right? *Coptic* and **BC** no more got this from a common original with coptic than **B** obtained his *αιωνιαν* in verse 30 from an original. ‡ **B** and coptic conspired to add *duo*, and **B** wanted to exhibit the real gender of *ζωνη* in verse 30. Because the unfortunate and erring **ms C** supports **B** here in verse 35, **Hort** places *duo in his text* in square brackets. Can any system be more vicious? Not even **L** or **Ψ** is found to support **BC** *copt*, and even **Δ** pulls away from the harmonising consortium of **BC**. **ΔΨ** really belong to the base **NBL**, so that their defection here is absolutely conclusive. Nor is the notable cursive 892 recorded by **Harris** nor **Soden's** other **mss** for this + *duo*.

Mark

- x. 37. > σου εκ δεξιων (*pro* εκ δεξιων σου) **NBC\*LDΨ** 892 *boh* [*non sah*] δ. In the second clause *boh* repeats σου εξ αριστερων **L<sup>sr</sup>**, σου εξ ευωνυμων **N<sup>sr</sup>**, against most εξ ευωνυμων σου, but **BDA** and **WΨ1** 1 [*non fam*] 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>1353</sup> omit the second σου with *b c d ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>2</sub> i k (om bis) q δ vg<sup>G bis</sup> vg<sup>Q</sup>*. It may be worth while to exhibit here *boh* and *sah*, which differ, as *boh* goes with **NBC\*LDΨ** in the first place:

*boh* ρινα πτε οτα ρεεσι κατεκοιναει οτορ οτα  
εεεον κατεκχαδη δεν πεκωοτ

*sah* κεκαc ερε οτα εεεον ρεεοοc ρι οταει εεεοκ  
ατω οτα ρι ρβοτρ εεεοκ ρεε πεοοτ πτεκεεπ-  
τερο.

46. προσαιτης (*pro* προσαιτων *vel* επαιτων) (**N**)**BLΔΨ** 892 *k* and *boh* *Sod txt* (*contra* **Merx** p. 130) but against the rest and against *sah*.

47. εστιν (*post* ιησους) **B** 273 **Paris**<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1493</sup> *sah* (*et syr*), *contra* **N** *rell omn et boh latt<sup>omn</sup>*.

49. ειπεν · φωνησατε αυτον (*pro* ειπεν αυτον φωνηθηναι) **NBCLΔΨ** 7 892 *Sod*<sup>ires</sup> *k δ* and *boh* only *W-H Sod txt*, against the rest and *sah* specifically and *Origen*. Here in two places within three verses we see **B** with *sah* and then with *boh*, as so often. Instead of a **B** text governing the joint base of *boh sah*, it would appear that **B** consulted *both* coptic versions, and possibly if we had the third coptic version we should see other points of sympathy there.

- xi. 1. βηδφαγη **B** *Cf. sah* 1/5 βηδφακη (*sah* 4/5 βηδφαγη)

- xii. 19. > και μη αφη τεκνον **NBCLΔΨ** 33 892 **Paris**<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> *ff<sub>2</sub> sah*

† But μετα των υιων αυτης. Only **U** *r<sub>2</sub>* add *duo* there.

‡ See under "Change of Gender."

Mark

[*non boh*] (*syr sin*). See remarks above. This order opposes everything else, and is refused by *Soden* text. But why?

- xii. 27. “πολυ πλανασθε” **NBCLWΔΨ** 892\* *Sod*<sup>1354 1443</sup> *k sah boh* against everything else including 33 and Paris<sup>97</sup> and *verss*: “*υμεις ουν πολυ πλανασθε.*” Here *Sod* encloses *υμεις ουν* in square brackets.

38. Out of three deliberate and distinct recensions **NBLΔΨ** 892 (*και εν τη διδαχη αυτου ελεγεν*) follow *boh* (against *sah*). So also *Sod txt*. See under “Two or more recensions in Mark.”

- xiii. 7. *δει* (—*γαρ*) **N\*BWΨ** *solī vid.*, *sah boh syr pesh*<sup>allq</sup> against all else and Paris<sup>97</sup> and *syr sin pesh*<sup>rel</sup>. *Sod* [*γαρ*]. No new evidence.

Why should we attribute this to coptic influence and not to a common base? Because at:

8. (**N**)**BL(W)Ψ** (28) elide both copulas *εσονται σεισμοι...εσονται λιμοι*, which is simply the coptic manner. It appeals to *Soden*.  
15. —*εις την οικιαν* **NBLΨ** 245 892 *Sod*<sup>duo</sup> *c k sah boh syr pesh* [*non sin*]. See under “Improvement.” (This does not appeal to *Soden*).

32. *αγγελος* (*pro oi αγγελοι vel oi αγγελοι οι*) *B*<sup>sol</sup> *et W-H*<sup>ms</sup>. This is a very pretty place and one of the few where we can swear that *B* saw the coptic and was influenced by it. In the first place observe that **NDKLUW<sup>b</sup>Σ** and some twenty-five minuscules write *οι αγγελοι*. In the second place note that *all* the rest, *i.e.* twelve uncials plus **WΦΨ** and *minn*, with *sah*, write *οι αγγελοι οι*. *B* then did not get this from *sah* although both *sahidic* and *bohairic* plurals do not change their termination, and in *sah* we read *οταε παγγελος ετζπ τπε·οταε πωμρε etc.* *B* could not have been copying *sah* or he would have seen the *ετ* in *ετζπ* following, which corresponds to the *οι* following *αγγελοι* in most Greeks. What was *B* doing? Well it may be that *sah* influenced *boh* for a singular, for *boh*, instead of *sah*’s *οταε παγγελος etc.*, has simply *οταε αγγελος* *θεν τφε*. At any rate *B* agrees with five or six codices of the *bohairic* alone here (with *Aug libere*). Whatever may be said of our other examples I pray the gentle critic and benevolent reader to ponder this very specially. Nor can it be said to me that these *bohairic* codices were following *B*. I deny it utterly. For in the very next verse *B* omits *και προσευχεσθε*, which no coptic mss do. And *B* is alone here with *D a c d k* against all else but one poor little cursive 122 which stands out thus like a lost sheep, apart from 1 13 28 157 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> which with **Ψ** and **W** go against *BD* here. Yet *W-H* om. *και προσευχεσθε*, and have *αγγελος* in margin.

Consult xiv. 18 beyond as to coptic methods by *B*.

35. (See under “Improvement.”)

Mark

xiv. 3. συντριψασα (— και) **NBLΨ boh.** All the rest have the copula. Even D 2<sup>pe</sup> with και θραυσασα, and *syr pesh* et aperuit, and *sah* 2e, yet *Sod txt* [no new mss] omits και as well as *W-H*.

7. + παντοτε in sec loco **BLN<sup>c</sup>Ψ 892 Laura<sup>A104</sup> soli cum sah boh.**

10. ὁ εἰς (pro εἰς) **NBC\*LMΨ 892 = boh** πιοταῖ against *sah* (οταῖ) (But immediately before **N\*BC\*DW?**) 13 28 440 *Laura<sup>A104</sup> Orig* omit ο before ισκαριωτης with *Latt* against *sah* and *boh.*)

18 *fin.* των εσθιοντων μετ εμου (pro ο εσθιων μετ εμου) **B<sup>sol</sup> cum sah boh.** [*Von Soden* omits *boh*, but adduces no new Greek evidence].

This, coupled with the places at viii. 37, xiii. 32, noticed above, is absolutely conclusive that B saw the Coptics. They alone have the matter thus in the plural. Not one Latin even, as far as I can see, has manducāt. All have the verb in the singular. And all Greeks, including W and the friendly Ψ, make no change.

20. — εκ **NBCL et WΨ** min<sup>aliqua</sup> et 892 [*non* 28 *non Paris*<sup>97</sup>] *sah boh.* The presence of W here (against 28) may be due to coptic. The other seventeen uncials with all *latt* (which have to render εκ) and *syr* oppose with εκ.

*ibid fin.* Observe the strange (but for possible support of C\*? *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup>) ΕΙCΤΟΕΝΤΡΥΒΛΙΟΝ for εἰς το τρυβλιον by B. *Tisch* says “εἰς το εν τρυβλιον (sive εντρ.)” but there is no such word as εντρυβλιον. The hand which went over B has added a smooth breathing over ἐν, but Westcott and Hort read it as ἐν, and actually place this in the text in square brackets. May it not be due to an error oculi from the coptic column 𐩨𐩣𐩪𐩬𐩢𐩪 the ἐν coming directly before το τρυβλιον there?

21. We cannot neglect the possibility of the previous point, when we see immediately following at the head of this verse the introductory coptic 𐩨𐩣 followed by **NBLΨ 892 Paris**<sup>97</sup> only seized again by *Soden's* Alexandrian mind. (W does not have it, yet it conflates υπαγει and παραδιδοται immediately afterwards).

24. το εκχυννομενον υπερ πολλων **NBCL et Ψ 892 (sol. inter minn)** *sah boh aeth W-H & Sod txt.*  
το υπερ (vel περι) πολλων εκχυννομενον **D unc**<sup>15</sup> et **WΣΦ minn**  
*omn vid. latt syr.*

35. επιπτεν (pro επεσεν) **NBLΨ 892 boh** [*non sah*] *W-H & Sod txt.* See under “Historic present” (imperfect).

40. > αυτων οι οφθαλμοι (pro οι οφθ. αυτων) **NBCLΔ et ΦΨ Sod**<sup>050</sup> 108 115 127 238 **e<sup>scr</sup> 892 Paris**<sup>97</sup> *Laura<sup>A104</sup> Sod*<sup>pauc</sup> *sah boh* (*more copt, non “ex more Marci” ut Tisch*). Against them are all the rest and W and the Latins and Syriac. (See below xiv. 65).

50. For και αφεντες αυτου παντες εφυγον of D, most Greeks (*syr*) *sah* and *latt* (as Matthew), the order is changed by **NBCLΔΨ**



Mark

61 258 435 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A104</sup> z<sup>scr</sup> H<sup>scr</sup> Sod<sup>aliq</sup> goth boh to και αφεντες αυτου εφυγον παντες, adopted by Sod.

It is noteworthy as exhibiting this well-known group of uncials hanging together with boh against sah.

(For the variations see Horner's note in sah.) The new ms W is with D and the mass and sah against boh.

xiv. 60. οτι (pro τι) BWΨ soli et W-H<sup>ms</sup> (cf. boh ΧΕ)

61. ουκ απεκρινατο ουδεν NBCLΨ 33 892 Laura<sup>A104</sup> sah both aeth Orig 1/2 W-H Sod, against ουδεν απεκρ. of the rest and W Orig 1/2.

65. >αυτου το προσωπον NBCLUΔΨ 33 108 127 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>quinque</sup> copt (See above xiv. 40) Sod follows both here and above.

68 fin. Om. NBLWΨ 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Evst 17 c boh sah syr sin [non Sod]. See under "Harmonistic."

69. ειπεν (pro ηρξατο λεγειν) Only B and sah boh aeth W-H<sup>ms</sup>. Nothing else. Take a cross reference from this (in Matt. xxvi. 71 λεγει) and see under "Harmonistic," and if it does not give my readers a startling picture of a coptic conspiracy with B I shall be surprised. In these other places B has some little support. Here however B is in solitary grandeur with sah boh aeth and these alone. N deserts him, CLΔΨ desert, W avoids it, D and all Latins contradict absolutely, and so do both syriacs. (Soden neglects to chronicle boh and aeth. This is careless for boh agrees absolutely, and this must be considered with xv. 15 below.)

xv. 12. - θελετε See under "Harmonistic."

15. παρεδωκεν δε τον ιω φραγ. B Sod<sup>1354</sup> and boh alone. See under "N and B differences" in Part II for the three varying orders.

23. - πιειν NBC\*LΔΨ 604 Sod<sup>tres</sup> n boh arm syr sin Cyr<sup>hier</sup> (against the rest and sah, all other Latins extant and syr and aeth).

36. - και (ante γεμισας) BLΨ [non minn vid] c (ff<sub>2</sub> i) vg<sup>GM</sup> boh (sah)

39. - κραξας NBL et Ψ 892 copt W-H Sod txt. (See "Improvement.")

40. + η (ante ιωσ. μητηρ) BΨ 131? soli et (sah boh)

### Latin and Coptic.

i. 2. - εγω BD Sod<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> latt sah 3/4

24. λεγων (- εα) NBDWA Sod<sup>050</sup> 28\* 157 372 2<sup>pe</sup> latt syr aeth boh (hiat sah) [Habent 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> rell unc et ΣΦ Orig Eust<sup>er</sup> Cyr]

ii. 22. ρηξει (pro ρησσει) NBCDL Sod<sup>050</sup> 33 892 2<sup>pe</sup> latt aliq et sah [non boh] W-H txt [non Sod] Cf Luc v. 37

Tisch asks if other cursives besides 33 give the future. Apparently

only 2<sup>pe</sup> and 892. The rest all have the present, and W gives the passive, retaining the present tense *διαρρησονται οι ασκοι*.

Mark

- iii. 9. *πλοιαρια* (*pro πλοιαριον*) B<sup>col</sup> *cum sah*. [*Sod* omits *sah*]. I place this here under Coptic and Latin, because the Latin “*ut navicula* (most omit *in*) *deseruiret*” may be responsible.
- iii. 18. *τον καναναιον* N<sup>BCDL</sup>Δ 33 372 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>351</sup> et *txt latt* (*ο κανανεος* W = *boh* ΠΙΚΑΠΛΗΕΟC) *contra κανανιτης sah et Gr rell et Sod*<sup>50</sup> 28 157 604 892 etc. *arm goth*.
- v. 6. See under “Latin.”
9. *λεγ. ονομα μοι + εστιν* B (D) *fam* 13 238 372 *latt*<sup>pl</sup> *sah boh*
- viii. 2. *προσμενουσι (-μοι)* B<sup>col</sup> *cum boh*<sup>tribus</sup> Cf D *ωδε εισιν et d ex quo hic sunt*.
33. -τω (*ante πετρω*) N<sup>BDL</sup> 21 only (*non al. minn vid*) W-H & *Sod*.
- ix. 8. *μετα εαυτων post ειδον* (instead of *fin*) B 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> c f and *sah* (*syr sin*) W-H, *non Sod*.

As it does not appear in Matt. xvii. 8 (except that 33 inserts there) it may have been early deleted from Mark and then added in the margin whence B copied into the wrong place, or else may mean sympathy with *sahidic* order, but *boh* keeps the usual order.

- x. 28. *ηκολουθηκαμεν* (*pro ηκολουθησαμεν*) BCDW *Sod*<sup>1043</sup> (*Sod*<sup>mss</sup>) *lat copt*

This follows *αφηκαμεν* and is probably alliterative as well. If *ηκολουθηκαμεν* be “neutral” then all the rest of the Greeks have fallen into a curious error! Even *Soden* recognises this.

- x. 43. (*pr loco*) *εστιν* (*pro εσται*) N<sup>BC</sup>\*DLΔWΨ *Sod*<sup>1354</sup> *it*<sup>pl</sup> *copt*
- xi. 17. *πεποιηκατε* (*pro εποησατε*) BLΔΨ *Orig* only W-H & *Sod txt*
- xiv. 40. *παλιν ελθων ευρεν αυτους* N<sup>BL</sup>Ψ 892 *copt q* [*non Sod*] }  
*και ελθων ευρεν αυτους* D a c d ff<sub>2</sub> k }

against *υποστρεψας ευρεν αυτους παλιν* W *rell pl*.

- †xv. 1. *πρωι* N<sup>BCDL</sup> et ΨΔ *Sod*<sup>50</sup> 46 892 *Sod*<sup>1337</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> *latt boh Orig* [for *επι το πρωι q A unc*<sup>13</sup> et WΣ *minn et* 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> *syr arm goth W-H & Sod* (*k\* e mane*)]  
*Sah aeth* and *e* = *cum autem mane factum esset*
8. *αναβας* N<sup>BD</sup> 892 *latt copt goth*, against *αναβησας* of the rest and even Δ<sup>st</sup>LW and Ψ all *minn* (but 892), *syr arm* and *diatess*, while *k* omits, and *aeth* conflates.

### Traces of Syriac.

- iii. 17. *ονομα* (*pro ονοματα*) BD<sup>st</sup> 28 225 271 *syr* (*boh*<sup>unus</sup>) W-H [*non Sod*] ‡
- iv. 20. -εν *sec et tert* B<sup>sol</sup> *cum Δ* (Cf *syr pesh*, *hiat sin*)  
 22 *fin*. *φανερωθη* B<sup>sol</sup> et (*sah syr pesh*)
- v. 2. -ευθεως BW *Sod*<sup>1385</sup> [*non ND d rell*] *sed* *syr*<sup>pesh sin</sup> *pers* 1/2 et b c e ff<sub>2</sub> i vg<sup>R</sup>

† Tisch omits the evidence of 2<sup>pe</sup>.

‡ Cf. *Merx*, pp. 40, 41.

Mark

- x. 47. *εστιν trsfert post ιησους* B<sup>sol</sup> *cum* 273 Sod<sup>1493</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *syr pesh*  
*syr sin (et sah)*
- xv. 40. *μαριαμ η μαγδ.* BCWΨ *fam* 1 *syr W-H* [*non Sod*].

## Form.

Mark

- i. 38. *εξηλθον* NBCL Sod<sup>050</sup> 33 179 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>1098</sup> *et Sod txt.* Al.  
*et D<sup>sr</sup> εξεληλυθα, vel εληλυθα* WΔΘ<sup>f</sup> 28 892 *al. et latt et d.*
39. This is followed by *ηλθεν pro ην* by NBL Sod<sup>050</sup> 892 [not even 33 or Paris<sup>97</sup>] *sah boh aeth* against all else and the other *syr arm goth* versions, which are solid for *ην*. To show that this is coptic *reaction* consider the unique *κηρυσσιν* of N following (for *κηρυσσων*) = *boh*. But Soden swallows *ηλθεν* as *W-H*.
40. *δυνη (pro δυνασαι)* B. This presupposes that every other Greek has changed *δυνη* or *δυνα* to *δυνασαι*. Soden's sympathetic Sinai mss do not join. See below, ix. 22/23.
- iii. 25. *στηναι (pro σταθηναι)* BL 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> and so *W-H Sod txt*, but apparently no other support.
26. *στηναι* NBCL Sod<sup>050</sup> 213 892 and *W-H Sod (om claus στηναι ... στηναι Paris<sup>97</sup> ex homoiotel.)*
- vi. 41. *παραιτιθωσιν* N\*BLM\*WΔΠ Sod<sup>sex</sup> *et txt, παραθωσιν* D *rell.*
- vii. 9. *τηρητε* B *Evst* 15 (*pro τηρησητε*); *στησητε* D *aliqu.*
24. *ηδυνασθη* NB only with Sod<sup>94</sup> for *ηδυνηθη*.
- viii. 6. *παραιτιθωσι* NBCLMΔ 372 892 *al<sup>pc</sup> Sod txt (rell παραθωσι)*
- ix. 18. *ειπα* NBFLWΨ 2<sup>pc</sup> *W-H & Sod (ειπον rell et Paris<sup>97</sup>)*
- 22/23. *δυνη pro δυνασαι bis* See under "Change of Mood."
- x. 39. *δυνομεθα* B
- xii. 40. *κατεσθοντες* B (*Cf Luc vii. 33*)
- xiv. 46. *επεβαλαν* NB
- xv. 21. *εγγαρευουσιν (pro αγγαρευουσιν)* N\*B\* scr<sup>P</sup> [*non W-H Sod*] (D has *ανγαρ...* here). This is almost purely a N.T. word. Only N at Matt. v. 41 changes to *ενγαρ*. At Matt. xxvii. 32 *ηγγαρευσαν* is used by all (including NB) except D *ηνγαρ...*, L *ηγαρ.*, and some *min ηγκαρ*. It does not occur outside of these three passages.

## Synonyms.

Mark

- ii. 12. *εμπροσθεν (pro εναντιον)* NBLW 187 *mg* 604 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> only, while *ενωπιον* is read by Θ<sup>1</sup>Φ Sod<sup>050</sup> *al.* 3 28 33 511 *Evst* 29 Laura<sup>A 104</sup>, and *εναντιον* by the mass and D. (*εμπροσθεν εναντιον Sod<sup>1441</sup>*).

If the original Latin *coram* is primitive and antecedent it will account for this more clearly than any "provincial" preferences.

Here *coram* is absolutely constant in all Latins. But observe

elsewhere what happens when the Greek is paramount (this list is quite imperfect):

Luke v. 19.	Gr. <i>εμπροσθεν</i>	ante <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , coram <i>δ</i> , in conspectu <i>a d</i>
xii. 8.	<i>εμπροσθεν</i>	coram <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , in conspectu <i>d</i>
	9. <i>ενωπιον vel εμπροσθεν</i> D <i>al.</i>	coram <i>latt</i> , in conspectu <i>d</i>
xiv. 2.	<i>εμπροσθεν αυτου</i>	ante illum <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> , apud ipsum <i>e</i> , presente illo <i>δ</i> , in conspectu ejus <i>d</i>
xix. 4.	<i>εις το εμπροσθεν</i>	Variant plur <i>latt</i>
	27. <i>εμπροσθεν μου</i>	ante me <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , coram me <i>e</i> , in conspectu meo <i>a d</i>
xxi. 36.	<i>εμπροσθεν του υιου του αἰου</i>	ante fil. hom. <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> <i>vg</i> , in conspectu fili hom. <i>d f</i>
Jo. x. 4.	<i>εμπροσθεν αυτων πορευεται</i>	ante eas vadit <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , coram eas vadit <i>δ</i> , praecedit eas <i>r</i>
xii. 37.	<i>εμπροσθεν αυτων</i>	coram eis <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , in conspectu eorum <i>d f (r)</i>
Luke i. 6.	<i>εναντιον (vel ενωπιον)</i>	ante <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , ante faciem <i>e</i> , in conspectu <i>d f Hier</i>
xxiv. 19.	<i>εναντιον (ενωπιον D)</i>	coram <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , in conspectu <i>c d e Aug</i>
Act vii. 10.	<i>εναντιον (vel εναντι)</i>	in conspectu <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , ante <i>gig</i> , coram <i>d</i>
viii. 32.	<i>εναντιον</i>	coram <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , ante <i>Iren 1/2 Tert</i> , in conspectu <i>Iren 1/2</i>
Luke i. 15.	<i>ενωπιον</i>	coram <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , in conspectu <i>a d Iren</i>
	17. <i>ενωπιον</i>	ante <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , in conspectu, <i>a d Iren Ambr</i> , coram <i>Tert</i>
	19. <i>ενωπιον</i>	ante <i>latt</i> <sup>pl</sup> et <i>vg</i> , in conspectu <i>a d f</i> , om <i>ff</i> .

This will be sufficient without going further to show what I mean. But I do not know whether I have made the matter clear. The point is that an original Latin *coram* in Mark ii. 12 may have given rise to the two Greek readings, while *coram* is constant among the Latins. But in the other Gospels and Acts the Greek rarely varies whereas two or three varieties are to be observed among the Latins throughout.

Note also :

Mark xii. 41. *απεναντι* BU<sup>Ψ</sup> 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>allq</sup> *κατεναντι* ND *unc*<sup>13</sup> et W<sup>ΣΦ</sup> (*κατενωπιον* 13-346-556.)

and ver. 36. *υποκατω (pro υποποδιον)* BD<sup>grT<sup>d</sup></sup> W<sup>Ψ</sup> 28 Sod<sup>1337</sup> *sah boh syr sin υποποδιον* N *rell et it et d et rell verss et LXX.*

This is quite an important place. For B makes several other changes in this verse. It omits *εν* before *τω πνευματι*, omits *ο* before *κυριος*, and substitutes alone *καθισον* for *καθου*. Hort makes a positive caricature of the LXX quotation, following B even to the placing of B's unique *καθισον* in his margin.

**Mark**

Mark

Mark

**Mark**

vi. 27. *ευεγκαι* **NBCΔ<sup>sr</sup>** 892 *copt* (active) for *ευεχθηναι* (passive) of DW and L and all the rest and *Latt adferri* (*b auferri*).

In St. Luke (xxii. 11) all have *φάγω* without change.

In St. Matthew xxvi. 18 the expression is  $\pi\omega\omega$  ( $\pi\omega\eta\sigma\omega$  D  $d$   $q$  *Orig*<sup>int.</sup> Cf. *sah*. It is impossible to divorce D from a coptic background).

*Change of Mood.*

iv. 29. παραδοι (*pro παραδω*)      **N**\*BΔΔ *Sod*<sup>7050</sup> 28 2<sup>pe</sup> [*non W*]  
(observe variations in *both* MSS here)

xiv. 10. παραδοι (*pro παραδω*) BC\*?W 28 (D προδοι)  
(observe variations in *sah* MSS here)

11. παραδοι (pro παραδω) BDW

In these passages in *ch.* iv. and xiv. the sense is different, so that the change is purely that of the grammarian.

In the first case in *ch.* iv. it is *οταν δε παραδοι ο καρπος*, in the second and third in *ch.* xiv. *ινα αυτον παραδοι αυτοις* (of Judas), and *αυτον ευκαιρως παραδοι*.

viii. 37. *δοι* (*pro δωσει*)      **N**\*B and *W-H txt*      while **N**<sup>c</sup>L and *Sod txt*  
write *δω*.

The sentence is (ἡ) τι γὰρ δώσει (or δώ or δόι) ἀντὶς ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;

The Latins support *δοσει* with *dabit*. The *sah* and *bok* are equally emphatic with a future indicative.

It remains for **N<sup>e</sup>L** *Sod* to give the subj. and **N\*B** *W-H* the optative against Origen. Who is revising here? [See for a change in the context under "Infinitive for the *εαν* construction."]

ix. 30.  $\gamma\nu\omicron$  (*pro  $\gamma\nu\omega$* ) by **NBDLC** (*cf sah*) apparently no cursives, not even 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> nor 28 (*me teste*) nor 2<sup>pe</sup>, which have  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\omicron\iota$  above at iv. 29. Surely this would not have been changed to  $\gamma\nu\omega$ , if  $\gamma\nu\omicron$  were original. W does not join here but does at xiv. 10, 11. Lake prints  $\gamma\nu\hat{\omega}$  for  $\Psi$ .

v. 43. *γνοι* for *γνω* by ABDLW Paris<sup>97</sup> [not 28 or others]. Westcott and Hort (ii. 168) treat this termination *οι* for *ω* as conjunctive *not* optative, but see Moulton's Winer, edition 1882, p. 360, note 2. And consult further: Luke i. 62 *θελοι*, Mark xi. 14 *φαγοι*, Act xxv. 16 *εχοι*. . *λαβοι*, Act ii. 12 *θελοι* (NE *rell*; *θελει* ABCD), xvii. 18 *θελοι* (all except D\* *θελη*, four cursives *θελει*). Also: Act xxii. 24 *επιγνω* by all. And finally: 1 Thess v. 15 *αποδοι*      N\*D<sup>b</sup> (D\* *etiam αποδοιη*) FG  
*αποδω*      N<sup>c</sup>ABD<sup>c</sup>EKLP *al. et Patres*

Also note Luke i. 4 of Theophilus *wa επιθυμῶν* by N\* alone. See Sir John Hawkins ('*Horae Syn.*' p. 53)... "It is well known that the optative was obsolescent in the ordinary Greek of N.T. times." Therefore is it not "revived" by B? Note

also Luke xix. 15. *γνοι* (*pro γνω*) **NBDL** 33 (against *Origen*). It should be observed that in this same verse **NBDL** 1-131 25 157 employ *δεδωκει* for *εδωκε* and *Origen* *εδεδωκει*, as if grammatical consideration had obtained here.† This is further emphasised by a complete change from *τις τι διεπραγματευσατο* to *τι διεπραγματευσαντο* by **NB(D)L(R)J** 157 *d e copt aeth (syr)* in the same verse. †

- Mark**  
 (ix. 22. *ει τι δυνη* **NBDILΔWΨ** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *fam* 1 273 [*non* 28 *hoc loco. Errat Tisch*] *pro ει τι δυνασαι* *rell omn.*  
 23. *το ει δυνη* **N\*BD**(- *το D Sod*<sup>050</sup>)**NΔW** (*τουτο pro το ut copt*) **Σ** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *fam* 1 28(- *το* 28) 892 *pro το ει δυνασαι rell omn et Ψ [om το KUIΠΦ]* )

But this *δυνη* may be merely a change of "form" of the indicative, and not the subjunctive.

Anyway *Ψ* shows consideration by having *δυνη* *ver* 22 with the minority, but not in verse 23,‡ while *Paris*<sup>97</sup> retains *δυνασαι* in both places and is unfaithful here to **NB**. *Fam* 13 also holds *δυνασαι* in both places.

We cannot judge of singular places like this without a correct tabulation. For instance *Tischendorf* makes no cross-reference here to *Mark* i. 40, but if we turn back there we find *B* indulging in *δυνη* for *δυνασαι* at that place and quite alone! Comment is unnecessary. With *B* it is simply a preference.

### Change of Tense.

- Mark**  
 i. 32. *εδυσεν* (*pro εδυ*) **BD** 28 *Sod*<sup>fam φ\*</sup> [*non Sod*<sup>050</sup>] *W-H*. 1st aorist for 2nd aor.  
 ii. 5. *αφienται* (*pro αφewνται*) **B** 28 33 2<sup>pe</sup> [*non* 604 *Paris*<sup>97</sup>] *it*<sup>pl</sup> *syr goth sah boh* against the rest and **WΣΦ** *rell* and *b f q*.  
 9. *αφienται* **NB** 28 2<sup>pe</sup> *boh* (*remittuntur a c e f g<sub>2</sub> ff q*) against *αφewνται* of the rest and *b* (*remissa sunt*). Cf *sah* "Thy sins will be forgiven thee," showing Egyptian consideration of this passage. *W-H* and *Soden* follow **NB**.  
 22. *ρηξει* (*pro ρησσει*) See under "Latin and Coptic."  
 iv. 1. *συναγεται* (*pro συνηχθη*) **NBCLΔ** *fam* 13 28 604 892 *Sod*<sup>1341</sup> (*fam* 1 *συνερχεται*) against *συνηχθη* of the mass (and *συνηχθησαν A etc.*) and the versions. *W-H* and *Soden* print *συναγεται*.  
 vi. 22. *ηρεσεν* (*pro και αρεσασης*) **NBC\*L(Δ)** 33 *c ff<sub>2</sub> copt*. This should probably come under "Coptic." It is rejected by *Soden*<sup>txt</sup>.  
 viii. 25. *εβεβλεπεν* (*pro εβεβλεψεν*) **N\*BL** 28 273 (**WΔ** *fam* 13 244 440 *syr*<sup>int</sup>).

Here we get an expressive imperfect (Alexandrian? Note **N\*** was corrected to it) and very unlikely to be dropped by the mass if it stood originally in the text. *Soden* accepts it.

† So *Soden*<sup>txt</sup>; while neglecting *γνοι* and all previous optatives. Is it consistent?

‡ Thus reversing the attitude of 28, which latter would seem the more correct.

*Change of Tense in participles.*

Mark

iv. 18. *ακουσαντες* (*pro ακουοντες*) **NBCDLA** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 1 10 *fam* 13 28 71 240 244 892 2<sup>pe</sup> *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> [*non Paris*<sup>97</sup>] *Sod*<sup>1094 1098</sup> *syr*<sup>sch</sup> *peah* *copt*, against rest and *Latin arm* and *aeth*. As regards possible Egyptian influence there is very little difference in the writing of the two forms. *Soden* accepts *ακουσαντες*.

[x. 17. *γονυπετων* D 28 *fam* 13, *geniculans latt* (*praeter a = genibus prostratus*)

*γονυπετησας Rell et W (et W-H Sod).*]

Thus *W*<sup>801</sup> at ix. 8 *περιβλεπομενοι* (*circumspicientes latt*<sup>p1</sup> for *περιβλεψαμενοι rell* and *circumspexerunt k*).

*Imperative.*

Mark ii. 9. *εγειρου* BL *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 28 372, *εγειρε ND plur* and *W (εγειραι ul.)*  
(In. ii. 11. *εγειρε NBW Sod*<sup>050</sup> *plur*, *εγειραι some*, and *εγειρου K*)  
(Consult also: vi. 22. *αιτησον B plur*, but *αιτησαι N* 2<sup>pe</sup> *Eust* 54 and *αιτησε NΣ, ετησαι W*).

xii. 36. *καθισον (pro καθου)* B alone. In this connection observe the other changes in this verse by B, not only slavishly followed by Hort against the usual LXX text, but *καθισον* placed in Hort's margin.

*Infinitive for the εαν construction.*

viii. 36. "τι γαρ ωφελησει (ωφελει) ανθρωπον εαν κερδηση (κερδησει) τον κοσμον ολον και ζημιωθη την ψυχην αυτου."

Here Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort and the Eng. Revision substitute the infinitive *κερδησαι* (with **NB** 892, *L κερδησας*) for *εαν κερδ.*, and *ζημιωθηναι* (with **NBL** 892) for *ζημιωθη*. *Soden* refuses this change.

Winer is silent. I ask can it be possible that **NBL** (against **DW**, the rest of the uncials and all the minuscules, against the Coptic and the Syriac, against the Gothic and all Latins) are really here the purveyors of a "pre-syrian" text? Or is it not an Alexandrian Greek preference and not even "neutral"?

Note that it is immediately following this (Mark viii. 37) that **N\*B** alone use *δοι* for *δωσει* (**N\*L** *δω*). [See above under "Optative."]

Note that the new witness *W*, in close agreement with *B* on both sides of this passage, yet knows nothing of these infinitives.

As a matter of fact **N** goes quite wrong here for he has already substituted *ανθρωπος* (for *ανθρωπον*) previously with *coptic*, making it the subject of *ωφελει* and not dependent on it. Thus: *τι γαρ ωφελει ανθρωπος*



κερδῆσαι is clearly not good. *τι γαρ ωφελει ανθρωπον κερδῆσαι* of BL will stand, but since coptic says *τι γαρ ανθρωπος ωφελησει* it follows with the *εαν* construction.

Let us examine further now Grammatical forms : *Change of case.*

*Genitive Absolute for Dative.*

Mark v. 2. *εξελθοντος αυτου* (*pro εξελθοντι αυτω* of the mass) **NBCLΔ**  
*Sod*<sup>050</sup> some twenty cursives of the same type and 892 Paris<sup>97</sup>.

This seems to aim at improvement, but D is absent writing *εξελθοντων αυτων* with *c d e ff* and *W*<sup>87</sup>. *Soden* follows **NBCLΔ**.

That B had considered this matter is seen elsewhere, for at vi. 54 B alone cancels *αυτων* in *και εξελθοντων αυτων* (not approved by *Hort*).

*Genitive Absolute for Accus. Abs.*

Mark ix. 28. *εισελθοντος αυτου* (*pro εισελθοντα αυτον*) with **NBCDLΔWΨ**  
*Sod*<sup>050</sup> *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 892 [*non* 33 Paris<sup>97</sup>] *W-H & Sod*  
*(it vg cum intrasset)*

Here again this seems grammatical preference, and very questionable at that, seeing that it is a question of motion : † *και εισελθοντα αυτον εις οικον οι μαθηται αυτου κατιδιαν επηρωτων αυτον*.

These cases in Mark must however be treated differently from those in the other Gospels. If it be a case of translation from Latin, it would not be "Egypt" or "Antioch" preferring genitive or accusative absolute, and changing an existing foundation Greek text, as much as two separate lines of translation appearing. (See remarks under this head in St. Luke.)

*Change of Case.*

Mark vi. 3. *ιωσητος* (*pro ιωση*) **BDLΔ** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *fam* 13 33 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 Paris<sup>97</sup>  
*a d boh W-H & Sod*<sup>87</sup> [*non sah*].

The sentence runs *ουχ ουτος εστιν ο τεκτων ο υιος* (or *ο του τεκτονος υιος*) [*της*] *μαριας και αδελφος ιακωβου και ιωσητος και ιουδα και σιμωνος* ;

This has a double significance. If it is a genitive for the apparent indeclinable *ιωση* (or *ιωσηφ*, as **N** 121, many latins, *vg* and *aeth* have it) it is a grammatical improvement to agree with *ιακωβου* and *σιμωνος*, but while *sah* has **ⲙⲙⲓ** *ιωση*, *boh* writes **ⲡⲉⲙⲙ** *ιωσητος* "with (and) Iosetos," as if *boh* had copied a text similar to that of **BDLΔ**, or they in turn had wandered to the *boh* and thought it a good idea seeing *ιωσητος* to decline *ιωση* and make a genitive of it. Anyhow I do not believe *ιωσητος* to be "neutral," but to stand at the opposite pole. **N**, very

† But St. Luke adopts the gen. abs. for this at ii. 42 *και οτε εγενετο ετων δωδεκα αναβαινοντων αυτων κατα το εθος της εορτης*.

useful as a control in this and many places, disagrees as above, while 892 writes *ωση*.

### *Change of Number.*

Mark i. 36. *κατεδιωξεν* (*pro κατεδιωξαν*) **NBMU** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 28 273 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *al*<sup>10</sup> † *g*<sub>2</sub> *l r*<sub>2</sub> *vg* and *δ*, as to “*αυτον Σιμων και οι μετ’ αυτου.*” To this *W* does not agree but, with **ΣΦD** and all the rest of the uncials and Paris<sup>97</sup> *syr*, gives us *κατεδιωξαν*, as also all other Old Latins and *vg*<sup>GM</sup>. These are not really vulgates, but Old Latin in Mark as well as in Matthew.

St. Jerome followed the **NB** reading, no doubt for the same preference. *Soden* retains *κατεδιωξαν*.

iv. 1 *fin.* *ησαν* (*pro ην*) **NBCLΔ<sup>gr</sup>** 7<sup>10</sup> 7 892 *Sod*<sup>duo</sup> *d* [*contra δ erat et D<sup>gr</sup> ην*]. This not only seems a pure “Egyptian” preference after *πας ο οχλος*, but is opposed by all other Greeks and *W* and all the Latins but *d*, which is here aberrant since the other Latin company deserts it exceptionally in this place. *Soden* reverses his position and adopts *ησαν*.

v. 13. *εισηλθεν* (*pro εισηλθου*) of *τα πνευματα τα ακαθαρτα* *B* against the rest, and exceptional on the part of *B*. (*W* is emphatic against *B* with the contemporary form *εισηλθαν*.)

Particular use :

Mark xiii. 3. *επηρωτα* (*pro επηρωτων*) **NBLW** 4 13-69-346-556 [*non* 124] 28 33 49 229 348 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1206 1250</sup> (*επηρωτησεν*<sup>351</sup>) (*boh<sup>aliq</sup> sah<sup>aliq</sup>*)

This makes Peter the spokesman, and looks very like revision [see above on i. 36]. The sentence is: *και καθημενου αυτου εις το ορος των ελαιων κατευαντι του ιερου επηρωτων (επηρωτα NBLW) αυτον κατιδιαν πετρος και ιακωβος και ιωαννης και ανδρεας ειπε ημιν...*

The Latins and *syr arm aeth* all oppose **NBLW**, the Coptic mss are divided and this small Greek group seems to be forcing the matter on Peter, because in the parallels there is absolutely no trace of this. Matt. xxiv. 3 is *καθημενου δε αυτου επι του ορους των ελαιων προσηλθον αυτω οι μαθηται κατιδιαν λεγοντες ειπε ημιν...* and Luke xxi. 7 *επηρωτησαν δε αυτον λεγοντες διδασκαλε ποτε ουν ταυτα εσται...*

*Soden* follows *Hort* however and accepts *επηρωτα* here in Mark.

### *Plural for Singular.*

Mark iii. 35. *τα θεληματα* *B* quite alone (and *W-H mg*) for *το θελημα* of apparently *all* others. Can it be supposed for a moment that *B* represents the foundation text here against all else? “*τα θεληματα του θεου*” grates very harshly on the ear. (Here again in a *graeco-sah* the change of the letter π to π

makes the difference of the plural without change of the noun's termination). *Sod* cannot find a single witness for B.

Ⲭ at Matt. vii. 21 has the plural alone against B and the rest.

In the whole range of N.T. writings το θελημα is essentially Matthaean Marcan Lucan Pauline Petrine and Johannine as well as being the expression of our Lord. The singular occurs 58 times. Only once a plural form (Acts xiii. 22, being an O.T. quotation of David).

Mark vii. 28. εσθιουσιν (*pro* εσθιει) following κυναρια. So ⲚBDLWΔ *Sod*<sup>750</sup> and some cursives and 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> against the rest.

(At another place like Mark xiv. 27 following προβατα the uncials are more evenly divided, but the same group as above less W and + ACFGKN adopt the plural.)

Mark ix. 15. ιδοντες (*pro* ιδων) } ⲚBC(D)ILWΔΨ1132833892  
εξεθαμβηθησαν (*pro* εξεθαμβηθη) } Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>al</sup> *syr* goth a b c d ff i  
following πας ὁ ὄχλος.

The question is Who made the change? *Soden* follows *Hort*.

*Plural for Singular.* [Not grammatical in the previous sense.]

Mark viii. 22. ερχονται (*pro* ερχεται) Ⲛ<sup>c</sup>BCDLWΔ *Sod*<sup>750</sup> a few cursives  
*copt aeth arm goth it vg*, changing the sense against Ⲛ\*  
the rest of *Greeks* and *syr* *diatess*.

The sentence is :

και ερχεται (or ερχονται) εις βηθσαιδαν και φερουσιν αυτω  
τυφλον και παρακαλουν αυτον...

Does it not seem that the "neutral" text (as opposed by Ⲛ\* and *syr*) is in danger of being accused of harmonising ερχονται with φερουσιν, for which there can be no adequate reason.

Why should the *Syr* oppose the *Latins* here? There is a curious method in these things. *Soden* adopts ερχονται.

Again

Mark ix. 14. ελθοντες *pro* ελθων } ⲚBLWΔΨ 892 *k arm*. *Soden* rejects this.  
ειδον ,, ιδεν }

33. ηλθον (*pro* ηλθεν) ⲚB(D)WΔ1 etc 2<sup>ps</sup> *Sod*<sup>sxx</sup> *it syr pesh diatess*  
*sah* (not *syr sin boh* which go with the large majority)

Here ηλθον is the harder reading, for the sentence is :

και ηλθον εις καφαρναουμ και εν τη οικια γενομενος επηρωτα  
αυτους.

Possibly here ⲚBDW are right (but *Soden* rejects). They have the support of *lat* and *syr vg diatess sah*, so that *syr sin* and *boh* may be wrong here.

In Evan 28 the text is ηλθεν, but in the margin the chapter inserter has written τω καιρω εκεινω ηλθεν ο ιησους και οι μαθηται αυτου εις καπερναουμ.

Therefore the Church lesson may on the other hand have given rise to ηλθον.

### Change of Gender.

Mark x. 30. *Ζωην αιωνια* (pro *ζωην αιωνιον*) B<sup>so1</sup>

This is not exactly a *change* of gender, but merely the emphatic form of the feminine. I have been curious enough to go through every other passage where *αιωνιος* is involved. The result is that in the Gospels nowhere else does B change *αιωνιον* to *αιωνιαν*, not even with *κολασις* at Matt. xxv. 46, nor does B modify "*τας αιωνιους σκηνας*" at Luke xvi. 9. In the rest of the New Testament, of the many places involving *ζωην αιωνιον*, B changes to *αιωνιαν* only at Acts xiii. 48 and at 1 Jo. ii. 25 *την ζωην την αιωνιαν* [not at 1 Jo. i. 2, iii. 15, v. 11, 13].

For the rest, at 2 Thess. ii. 16 *παρακλησιν αιωνιαν* is read by all except FG *αιωνιον*.

At 2 Pet. i. 11 C\* 42 read *εις την αιωνιαν βασιλειαν*, but B and the rest *αιωνιον*.

At 2 Cor. v. 1 all hold *αιωνιον* although following two feminine nouns: *οικοδομην...οικιαν αχειροποιητον αιωνιον*.

So that there is no rule guiding B or the others, only an occasional preference.

At Hebrews ix. 12 *αιωνιαν λυτρωσιν* seems to be read by all, but *αιωνιον* is not modified elsewhere in Hebrews, while at 1 Peter v. 10 *εις την αιωνιον αυτου δοξαν* is read by all and not *αιωνιαν* as we might expect of B.

Mk. xiv. 3. Common text and GMWΦ *μιν το αλαβαστρον* (*in sec loco*); **Ν**\*ADEFHKSUUVW<sup>b</sup>XY<sup>Gres</sup>ΓΔΣΠ] *τον αλαβ.* but BL**Ν**<sup>c</sup>CΔΨ Paris<sup>97</sup> *την αλαβ.*

The Greeks made alabaster *masc.* or *fem.* (Liddell and Scott), Herodotus using the *masc.* and Plato the *fem.* article. Perhaps there was a difference in the use to which the word was put. In the parallels and above in this verse no article is used. It certainly looks as if B and companions had wished to show their grammatical instinct and had made a *change* here, for **Ν** has *τον*, and only **Ν**<sup>c</sup> brings his text into conformity with B. As to W, it with Φ (and GM reported by Tisch.) has *το*. W does not even agree with 28, the latter having *τον*.

### Change of Order.

*As to Order consult*

Matt. v. 4/5, where for *μακαριοι οι πραεις*, to come before *μακαριοι οι πενθουντες*, D 33 a c ff<sub>1</sub> g<sub>1,2</sub> h k l vg syr cu' witness with *Clem Origen* (specifically, see *Treg 'Printed Text,'* p. 187) *Nyss Bas*

*Hil* and the Eusebian canons, while **SB** and the rest, with *b f q syr sin pesh copt arm aeth* and *Tert*, followed by *W-H*, put *πενθουντες* first. [*Sod* errs as to Δ and 604.]

The question is whether this is scientific. If *W-H* want *Origen's* text, he is a witness here *against* them and supported by the section authority of *Eus Am.* This passage was omitted from consideration in its proper place. Now as to St. Mark observe:

Mark ii. 10. *αφιεσαι αμαρτιας επι της γης* **BΦ** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 142 157 273 *al*<sup>5</sup> *aeth W-H*  
 against *αφ. επι της γης αμ.* **A** *etc. (et Sod txt)*  
*επι της γης αφ. αμ.* **Σ** *D mult et verss*  
 and *-επι της γης* **W b q**

Probably **B** omitted and found *επι της γης* in his margin, adding afterwards. At any rate **W** points this way, as that Greek ms now comes to join the Latin *b-q* for omission of *επι της γης*.

An exceedingly useful commentary on this supposition is offered in the very next verse but one. Instead of *και ηγερθη ευθως και απας τον κραβ.* of most mss and versions, **NBC\*L** 33 and four *boh* mss (*arm*?) say *και ηγερθη και ευθως απας τον κραβ.* which is not the same thing at all. Now *ευθως* is omitted outright by *b c e ff q*, and the new Greek ms **W** not only comes to join them but gives the Greek in the Latin form of *b q* as *ille autem surgens tulit* by writing: *ο δε εγερθεις και απας...* Probably again here **SB** took *ευθως* from the margin of their exemplar and slipped it in the wrong place. *W-H* and *Soden* follow **NBCL**.

Mark v. 25. *δωδεκα ετη (pro ετη δωδεκα)* **NBCLΔW** *fam* 1 [*non* 118] 28 *fam* 13 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> 892 *al.* *perpauc* and *Coptic W-H & Sod txt*, not *syr* nor *lat*.

This needs no comment.

vi. 2. > *διδασκειν εν τη συναγωγη* **NBCDLΔ** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> *al*<sup>2</sup> 33 892 7<sup>pe</sup> *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *d f ff<sub>2</sub> (r)* *sah boh aeth syr arm.* *Contra rell omn et W et latt et goth.*

I am convinced that the change of order is an improvement and wrong, although **D d f ff<sub>2</sub>** join **SB** here for it. The other Latins (which from v. 40 to v. 43 hung absolutely together) oppose and have the support of **W** plus eleven uncials and **ΣΦ** and 1 13 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604. Besides *goth* opposes and neutralises *f* here, as *W e* neutralise **D d**. It is doubtless the Egyptian order to which **D d** have been accommodated in this place. *Sod* rejects, and most unscientifically, having followed the group at v. 25. *Mk. vi. 26.* > *αθετησαι αυτην* **NBCLNΔΣ** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 179 *Sod*<sup>351 1441</sup> 892 against **DW** and all the rest and the *Latin* order *αυτην αθετησαι (om αυτην 69 265 Sod*<sup>1444</sup> *c syr sin)* *Sod* again stultifies his method by following **SB** *etc.*

49. > *επι της θαλ. περιπατουντα* **NBLΔ** *Sod*<sup>750 351</sup> 33 892 *Paris*<sup>97</sup> *c<sup>scr</sup> syr sin (cf Matt. xiv. 26)* *W-H & Sod* against **DW** and all the rest and against the order of the versions, including Coptic.

It might be thought that **NBLΔ** were original and "neutral" here (*obs. syr sin*), but *why* should all the rest change? Further, observe that

immediately following, the *same* group **NBLA** 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> (without 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *al.*) change *φαντασμα ειναι* to *οτι φαντασμα εστιν* with *copt*† (*cf syr*). Both changes cannot be right. The latter (if not the former) seems a clear theft from Matthew. It is rejected by *Soden*.

Mk. vii. 5. > ου περιπατουσιν οι μαθηται σου **NBLA** 33 179 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1216</sup> *Evst* 49 *boh aeth*, against *sah* all the other Greeks and DW and *latt syr arm goth*. There can be no question here but that the same vicious little group is wrong, yet *Soden* follows. Not only does *sah* oppose, but all the Latins and DW and the other important minuscules. *Tisch* merely quotes "copt" for the change. We know now that it is *boh* and not *sah*.

27. > τοις κυνariois βαλειν **NB** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *fam* 1 28 [*non W*] 892 *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> & <sup>371</sup> *Evst* 49 150 *q* against > βαλ. τοις κυν. everything else and D and W and all *latt* (but *q*) and *copt syr*. Even Paris<sup>97</sup> opposes **NB** here. It is nothing but an "improvement" on their part yet *Soden* follows!

Here there is not agreement with Coptic or Latin order (except *q*) so that there must be another reason for it. The fact that the Latins and copts put the βαλειν ahead of τοις κυνariois does not lend colour to a "neutral" order here. It would seem like an Alexandrian preference and rounds out the sentence better. Besides when W and 28 oppose each other it is always wise to go carefully. Here the younger codex goes with **NB** against the one which is a contemporary of **NB**.

vii. 29. > εκ της θυγατρος σου το δαιμονιον **NBLA** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 892 *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> *boh et W-H Sod txt* (*contra sah et rell omn et DW verss*).

ix. 1. A small matter. Practically all Greek authorities write: *οτι εισι τινες των ωδε εστηκοτων* while B(D\*) says *οτι εισι τινες ωδε των εστηκοτων*, refusing to separate the article from *εστηκοτων*. *W-H* follow this without marginal comment, so that it evidently commended itself strongly to them. So do *Tisch Treg* (*cf. latt*) not *Soden*. But why should all other Greeks oppose B if B be right here? Is it not more like the grammatical preference of a purist?

xii. 19. See under "Coptic."

xiii. 10. > πρωτον δει (*pro δει πρωτον*) **NBD<sup>gr</sup>Ψ** 28 299 892 *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>duo</sup> *Evst* 53 *al. pauc. a n l vg W-H & Sod txt.*

and πρωτον δε δει **W** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 108 115 124 [*non* 157 *errat Birch*] 2<sup>pe</sup> *al. pauc. c d ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>2</sub> i (k) r sah.*

This is bound up with a matter of punctuation as to whether the first part of verse 10 belongs to verse 9. It has led to *sah* and *syr pesh* [not *sin*] transferring *εις παντα τα εθνη* to the end of verse 10, and to a very curious conflation in D *d ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>2</sub>*, where holding *και εις παντα εθνη* at the beginning they add *εν πασι τοις εθνεσιν* at the end.

That a *n* do not do this proves once more that this happened in D *d*

after the old base (which *a n* used) had been modified. Observe W here has a space before *πρωτον δε δει* (W alone now comes to join a very small group) definitely reporting back *και εις παντα τα εθνη* to verse 9. As 28 only has *πρωτον δει* with **NBDΨ** it looks as if the 28 base were older than W and that the parent of W had inserted *δε* in order to make this matter of punctuation secure, after the **NBD** type had changed *δει πρωτον* to *πρωτον δει*.

Birch has erred as to 157 reading *πρωτον δε δει*. Correct Tischendorf and Horner. 157 reads *δει πρωτον*.

**N\*** really reads *πρωτον* (or *πρωτος*) *λαῶν δει* which *Tisch* does not refer to in his edition of the N.T. [Paris<sup>97</sup> has *δει πρωτον*.]

xiv. 64. *αυτον ενοχον ειναι* (*pro αυτον ειναι ενοχον*) **NBCLΔΨ** 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>trcs</sup> et *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> l q. This seems to be in the nature of improvement. D d ff<sub>2</sub> omit *ειναι*; Laura<sup>A 104</sup> places it last. W goes with the majority of Greeks and Latins for *ειναι ενοχον*.

65. This is followed by > *αυτου το προσωπον* **NBCLUΔΨ** 33 108 127 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>trcs</sup> et *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> bringing the possessive first as *Coptic*. The usual conspirators remain well together here, only joined by U 108 127; W and the rest are against it. Observe 108 127 do the same at xiv. 40.

67. See under "Differences between **N** and B" no less than seven differing orders. Of these **BCLΨ** *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 892 alone cling together for *μετα του ναζ ησθα του ιησου*, which, instead of being neutral and basic (as *Hort & Soden* would have us believe by using this order in their texts without marginal comment), is opposed by all others, thus: 33 remaining alone with *sah boh*, **N** alone with both *syriacs*, W with *fam* 1, 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604, while the large groups are represented by DΔ and all Latins, and AN *unc*<sup>12</sup> on the other hand. But in this division none place *του ιησου* last! *Eusebius* is extant and he goes with Paris<sup>97</sup> and DΔ *latt* practically, although having *ης* with W *fam* 1 2<sup>pe</sup> 604. It must be an "improvement" by **BCLΨ** 892.

### Historic Present.

See lists in Hawkins, 'Horae Syn.' p. 144/149. There is a difficult place in

Mark xi. 7 where **N\***CW *Sod*<sup>750</sup> *fam* 1 including 91-299 *fam* 13 28 *Sod*<sup>1337</sup> substitute *αγουσιν* for the *ηγαγον* of most (= Matt. Luke), while **BN<sup>c</sup>LΔ** 892 Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *Orig.*, holding the present, substitute *φερουσιν* as W-H *Sod* *txt*. [D = *ηγαγον*.]

These groups come together in the same verse (+D) for *επιβαλλουσιν* instead of *επεβαλον*.

Are these authorities forcing an historic present on Mark, or do they represent the real "neutral" text here? The only commentary offered

is at the close of the verse, where *καθίζει* is substituted for *εκαθισεν* but only by D<sup>sr</sup> (*d* sedebat) W *fam* 1 28 91 241 2<sup>pe</sup> (Cronin) 604.

Here W 28 conspire to indicate a completer revision, while D remains composite: *ηγαγον... επιβαλλουσιν... καθίζει*.

At the close of the verse **NBCDLA** Sod<sup>550</sup> min<sup>12</sup> W-H Sod substitute *επ αυτον* for *επ αυτω* of all the rest (including W and 28). While in the next verse WD 28 and two of the cursives (2<sup>pe</sup> 604) which wrote *επ' αυτον* conspire to substitute with the Latins *εστρωννον* for *εστρωσαν*. In this verse 8 **NBLA** 892 *l* W-H Sod *txt* write *κοψαντες* for *εκοπτον*. There are other clear indications of revision hereabouts. By whom is the question.

The apparent Alexandrine preference for the imperfect over the aorist, a kind of historic present or imperfect,† is seen in some other places as Mark ix. 38. *εκωλυομεν* (for *εκωλυσαμεν*) by **NBD<sup>sr</sup>LA** Sod<sup>550</sup> *fam* 1 W-H Sod, and it is noteworthy because repeated in Luke ix. 49 by **NBL<sup>E</sup>** 157 Paris<sup>97</sup> *a b e l* W-H Sod against the mass in both places.

See also

Mk. viii. 25. *ενεβλεπεν* for *ενεβλεψεν* **N<sup>c</sup>BL** 28 273 (WΔ *fam* 13 244 440 *sy*) W-H Sod.

That the historic present was revived can be seen in other mss as C\* alone at Luke x. 30 *καταβαινει* for *κατεβαινεν*. Cf. Orig 2/3 Matt. xiv. 19 *κελευει*.

B is absolutely alone at Mark i. 18 using *ηκολουθουν* for *ηκολουθησαν* against all Greeks and versions.

Mark ii. 8. *λεγει* (*pro* *ειπεν*) **NBLW** 33 892 [*non min al. magni momenti*] *e f g<sub>2</sub> vg* W-H & Sod *txt*.

16. *pr loco* *οτι εσθιει* (*pro* *οτι ησθιεν* **NDL** Sod<sup>txt</sup>) B 33 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *b d* [*sed* D<sup>sr</sup> *ησθιεν*] *ff r syr boh arm aeth* W-H (*αυτον εσθιοντα* A *plur a f q goth*). *W e sec loco* (*pr. om*) *εσθιει et manducat*.

iii. 8. *ποιει* (*pro* *εποιει*) BL only W-H *txt* [*non Sod*] against ND and all the rest + WΣΦ and cursives. Only *sah* and *boh*<sup>5</sup> support BL.

iv. 1. *συναγεται* **NBCLA<sup>sr</sup>** *fam* 13 28 604 892 Sod<sup>1341</sup> *et txt*, (*fam* 1 see below), against *συνηχθη* DW *unc*<sup>9</sup> and ΣΦ all Latin and δ and versions, and *συνηχθησαν* A 2<sup>pe</sup> *al. pauc.* and some *verss*, as Matt, while the 1 *fam* is hopelessly divided, 1-209 reading *συνερχεται*, 131 *συνερχονται* and 118 *συνηχθη*.

vi. 1. *ερχεται* (*pro* *ηλθεν*) **NBCLA** 892 W-H & Sod *txt*, *sed* confuse Sod in *notul*. (*a?* *venit, al. aliter*: *abiit ut* D *καπηλθεν sic*) No *minn* except 892 join and this would seem a purely arbitrary change. Note that W elides *εκειθεν και ηλθεν* and has only *και εξηλθεν εις την πατριδα αυτου*. (*Obs. ερχεται* i. 40, v. 22, vi. 48, x. 1, xiv. 17, 37, 41, 66 by all *ex lat?* *VENIT*.)

The reading of the group **NBCLA** is absolutely opposed by Origen: "*και ο μαρκος δε φησιν και ηλθεν εις την...*"

† Observe W alone at i. 26 *ανεκραγεν* for *φωνησαν* of **NBL** 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> Orig W-H Sod and *κραξας* of D and *κραξαν* of the rest.



[A place of great conflict. I lay no emphasis upon it because tenses are all mixed up in this chapter :

- Mark vi. 16. *ελεγεν* **NBCLΔ<sup>sr</sup>** 33 892 *f boh* | *ait δ d et b g<sub>1.2</sub> i l q r vg*  
*ειπεν* **AD<sup>sr</sup>** 33 *unc<sup>10</sup> et W a c ff<sub>2</sub> sah goth syr Sod<sup>txt</sup>  
vii. 14. *λεγει* **B** 59 only (against *ελεγεν* **NBW** *rell omn et latt*  
*et ειπεν Sod<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> a n syr copt*)  
viii. 6. *παραγγελλει* **NBD<sup>sr</sup>L** 892 *l vg<sup>5</sup> W-H Sod txt* (praecipit, *non*  
*al. latt et d = praecepit et c ff<sub>2</sub> jussit*)  
*παραγγειλας* **Sod<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup>**  
*παρηγγειλε* *Rell et W et επεταξε vid Orig (και ο Μαρκος.*  
*επεταξε φησιν αυτοις παντας ανακλιναι· ευθαδε δε ου κελευει*  
*αλλα παραγγελλει τω οχλω ανακλιθηναι. Hinc perperam (?)*  
*παραγγελλει* **NBD<sup>sr</sup>L**.*

To these add perhaps of the man cured of the Legion of Devils :

- v. 18. *να μετ αυτου ην* (*pro η*) **B\* Δ<sup>sr</sup>** only. The copts stopped to consider this passage, for instead of *eset* of the Latins, they have "follow" or "remain with," or "go with" as *aeth*, but all in indirect discourse.  
viii. 36. *ωφελει* (*pro ωφελησει*) **NBL** and **W<sup>vid</sup>** 892 *a n q Aug W-H Sod txt* against all the rest (and against 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> *ωφεληθησεται cf syr*) and against *sah boh Orig*. Correct *Tisch*, for *sah boh* are clear.  
ix. 13. *ηθελον* **NBC\*D<sup>sr</sup>** [*contra d*] **LΨ** 892 *W-H Sod txt, cf boh*  
(*k oportebat illum facere*)  
*ηθελησαν* **A unc rell<sup>12</sup> WΣΦ minn et Paris<sup>97</sup> latt** [*Male Sod*]  
*et d voluerunt sah.*  
x. 10. *επηρωτων* **NBLΔΨ** *Sod<sup>050</sup> min pauc et Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> 892  
*W-H & Sod txt*  
*επηρωτουν* **C c<sup>scr</sup>**  
*επηρωτησαν* **D rell omn et WΣΦ minn longe pl. latt copt syr goth.**  
[*In ver. 13 NBCLΔΨ* reverse this† and write the aorist against the imperfect, but in Mark these matters are very much involved.]  
xiv. 35. *επιπτεν* (*pro επεσεν*) **NBLΨ<sup>712</sup>** (*επιπιπτεν*) 892 [*non Paris<sup>97</sup>*]  
*boh W-H Sod, contra sah et latt<sup>omn</sup>*. This is nothing but a crib from *boh* [not *sah*, observe] and notice the manner of *boh* in expressing it. (*Cf. D Clem sol. αναπιπτε pro αναπεσε Luc xiv. 10*)  
49. *εκρατει* **B sic, sed εκρατειτε Ψ<sup>sol</sup>** (*pro εκρατησατε rell*). Until Mr. Lake published the text of Ψ, B stood alone; not even 892 has *εκρατειτε*.  
x. 43. (*pr loco*) *εστιν* (*pro εσται*) **NBC\*DLΔ et WΨ** *Sod<sup>050</sup> it<sup>pl</sup> vg*  
*copt W-H Sod txt (contra rell)*.*

Observe in xii. 41 where **Σ** 273 use *θεωρει* (only *c vidit*) against *εθεωρει* *Gr rell* and *latt boh* 'aspiciebat' or 'videbat,' *Origen* once uses *θεωρει* and once *εθεωρει*.

† *Soden* amusingly abandons *W-H* and the group here, for he loves the imperfect.

And, as bearing on Alexandrian custom, exhibited elsewhere, observe the preference for the imperfect even over the present at

Mark

vi. 35. ελεγον **NBLΔ**<sup>gr</sup> *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *boh W-H Sod* (quite a characteristic group) against λεγουσιν of nearly everything else and DW, while *it*<sup>pl</sup> say *dicentes* as *sah*.

vii. 27. ελεγεν **NBLΔ** *Sod*<sup>050 1443</sup> 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *boh W-H Sod* (λεγει *D*<sup>gr</sup> 604 *a q*, *Rell W et latt*<sup>pl</sup> *et d sah ειπεν*)

x. 23. ελεγεν **N**\*C *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> (against λεγει of B *plur*)

And observe *Clement* when quoting x. 17 avoids both γονυπετων of D 28 *fam* 13 (geniculans *latt*<sup>pl</sup>) and γονυπετησας *Gr*<sup>pl</sup> (genibus prostratus *a*, et cum prodisset genibus *k*) and says ἐγονυπέτει.

But the treatment of this matter generally in St. Mark by the **NB** family is quite different from that exhibited in the other Gospels. Frequently they render an aorist for an imperfect. They were so bent on having their own way that I infer from this that if they were translating from Latin they often supposed the Latin imperfect would be better rendered by an aorist, but this subject is extremely complicated in Mark as in everything else in the Gospel. Take vi. 56 for instance. There are five imperfects in this verse; <sup>(1)</sup> *introibat*, <sup>(2)</sup> *ponebant*, <sup>(3)</sup> *deprecabantur*, <sup>(4)</sup> *tangebant*, and <sup>(5)</sup> *salvi fiebant*. The first and third are agreed to by all, but **NBLΔ** *W-H Sod* and five lectionaries prefer *επιθεσαν* to *ετιθουν*, **NBD**<sup>gr</sup> (against *d latin tangebant*) **LΔ** *min*<sup>s</sup> *a ff*<sub>2</sub> and *W-H* prefer *ηψαντο* to *ηπτοντο*, and while nearly all are agreed as to *εσωζοντο* (*διεσωζοντο* *N min aliq*), 33 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> want *εσωθησαν* with *a*, and **Δ** *διεσωθησαν*.

#### HARMONISTIC.

##### Omissions.

ix. 38. — *ος ουκ ακολουθει ημιν* (*vel μεθ ημων* *D a d k*) **NBCLΔΨ** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 10 115 346 ?? 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>1094 1096</sup> [*non txt*] *Evst* 44 *f* [*non goth*] *boh syr pers aeth*. The character of this group makes it probable that they all consulted Luke and found the clause absent and so excised it from Mark. Why should nearly all the rest of the Greeks be so pleonastic if not genuine: *ος ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν*? But *DXW latt* complicate matters with *Soden* by leaving out the *οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν* at the end.

x. 6. — *ο θεος* by only **NBCLΔ** *Sod*<sup>309</sup> [*non Sod*<sup>txt</sup>] *c d sah boh*. Not even **Ψ** omits, and all others and *syr*, *rell latt*, *aeth arm goth* have it. The passage here must be influenced from Matt. xix. 4 where it is absent.

19. Here again **BKΔΠWΣΨ** invite us to throw out St. Mark's *μη αποστερησης* witnessed to by all Latins, by *syr pesh sah boh aeth*, by **N** and *D* and most Greeks, as well as by **CL** and *c k* which were with *B* at x. 13 *fin* (see above), which seems to be simply because the words are absent in the parallel

Mark

accounts of St. Matthew and St. Luke. In  $\Delta$  there is a big space showing the writer was aware of his strange recension. *Syr sin* and *arm* support B *dc.* and one lorn *vg<sup>L</sup>*. But the rest and the coptics are all against this excision nor do *W-H Sod* accept it.

- xiv. 68 *fin. και (ευθεως) αλεκτωρ εφωνησεν.* This is omitted by  $\aleph$ BL and W [non 28]  $\Psi$  892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Evst* 17 *c syr sin sah boh* [non *aeth*] *W-H* [non *Sod*] but by these only, and no doubt because not found in Matthew and Luke. The whole chapter has been a tissue of harmonies (in which Origen and D have played a part) and I do not refer to many of them. The presence of W here, absent for the most part from the  $\aleph$ B combinations in this chapter, is probably due to coptic influence, for both versions of the coptic omit here. But the Latins speak with no uncertain sound including *k*, and with *syr pesh* and the rest of the Greeks including D and C $\Delta$  (otherwise generally with  $\aleph$ BL $\Psi$ ) oppose *c*, which here shows its frequent critical Egyptian tendency.

Observe B in the next verse omitting *παλιν* alone with M Paris<sup>97</sup> coptics and W. Practically all oppose, including the friendly 892 and  $\aleph$ CL $\Delta$  and  $\Psi$ , only varying the position.

- xv. 10. — *οι αρχιερεις* B 1 [non *fam*] Paris<sup>97</sup> [non 892] *Sod*<sup>pauc</sup> *Evst* 13 17 *boh* [non *sah*] *syr sin* [non *pesh*]

*Cf. Matt xxvii. 18* where the words are absent, but we can give B the credit of omitting from homoioteleuton in Mark as the next words in xv. 11 are a repetition “*οι δε αρχιερεις.*” If I concede this, I would like my critics to allow me to date *boh* here quite as early as B, and not relegate poor *boh* to the VII<sup>th</sup> century.

12. — *θελετε (ante ποιησω)*  $\aleph$ BC $\Delta$  et W $\Psi$  1 [non *fam*] 13–69 [non 124–346] 33 291 892 *Sod*<sup>1093</sup> *sah boh* (ut *Matt xxvii. 22*) contra *rell omn et* Paris<sup>97</sup> *latt syr aeth arm.* *Soden* accepts the omission.

Again here the presence of W is accounted for from coptic sympathy.

#### Additions.

- i. 34. + *χ<sup>ν</sup> ειναι post οτι ηδειςαν αυτον* by BLW $\Sigma$  892 and CGM *al.* (του *χ<sup>ν</sup>*) *aeth* and *boh* (ex *Luc iv. 41*) but absolutely contradicted by  $\aleph$ D and the rest and even Paris<sup>97</sup> [against 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 etc.] with *syr goth pers* and *Vict<sup>ant</sup> disert.* *Soden* excludes.
38. + *αλλαχου*  $\aleph$ BC\*L 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> *sah boh arm aeth*, but against all others and W as well as 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 and *latt syr* (ex *Luc iv. 43* “*και ετεραις πολεσιν ευαγγ. με δει*”...). *Soden* excludes.

[This combination here of  $\aleph$ BCL 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> against the rest is only *one* recension, for at the end of the same verse they

Mark

have ἐξηλθον· together against *all* the rest again, who have ἐξέληλυθα or ἐληλυθα.]

- i. 40. + κυριε BCLWΣ Paris<sup>97</sup> a<sup>7</sup>l<sup>11q</sup> copt arm aeth c e ff vg<sup>6</sup> (ex Luc v. 12 et Matt viii. 2) Not received by Soden.
- iii. 14. + ους και αποστολους ωνομασεν NBC<sup>\*vid</sup> WΔ fam 13 28 238 Sod<sup>1132</sup> [non Sod<sup>txt</sup>] δ only with boh sah aeth (ex Luc vi. 13). This is opposed by all the rest and D and latt arm and goth and syr. Hort unfortunately takes it into his text without marginal comment but R-V and Soden cast it out as Tischendorf had done before them. W is errant here writing και εποιοησεν ιβ μαθητας ινα ωσιν μετ αυτου ους και απcστολους ωνομασεν, for W adds μαθητας first and interposes ινα ωσιν μετ αυτου before making the addition. D and the Latins control the situation.
- vi. 20. (= Luke ix. 7) ηπορει for ποιει. See under "Coptic."
49. οτι φαντασμα εστιν (pro φαντασμα ειναι) NBLΔ 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> W-H [non Sod] = Matt xiv. 26.

Observe in the same verse the order επι της θαλασσης περιπατουντα, of NBLΔ Sod<sup>750 351</sup> 33 c<sup>scr</sup> 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> syr sin only, is the order of Matthew, accepted by W-H and by Soden.

### Changes.

- ( viii. 21. νοειτε (pro συνιετε) B<sup>sol</sup> (D) Vide sub "Coptic."

I prefer not to regard this as harmonistic from Matt xvi. 11 because of the presence of ουν in some copies and of σε in sah, and because the sah word is almost νοειτε transliterated. )

- ix. 14. ελθοντες...ειδον (pro ελθων...ειδεν) NBLWΔΨ 892 k sah arm Cf Matt. and Luke. See remarks elsewhere as to opposition to the rule of preferring the harder reading. Rejected by Soden.

- x. 13 fin. αυτοις NBCLΔΨ Paris<sup>97</sup> 892 c k boh sah<sup>unus</sup> 1/2 W-H τοις προσφερουσιν practically all others and WΣΦ minn omn vid and the other versions and all other Latins.

This is simply accommodation by NB etc to the Matthaean and Lucan accounts and about as vicious a matter as we can find. There are only two sah codices here extant and they oppose each other. Westcott and Hort have the temerity to place αυτοις in their text without a word in the margin. And—would it be believed?—R-V ed. 1910 follows suit, with no footnote. It had corrected the harmonising blunder above of the same authorities, who wrote ινα αυτων αφηται instead of ινα αφηται αυτων against Origen's specific information, and yet here Souter's edition perpetuates a fourth-century harmony, in very bad taste then as it is now. Soden avoids this. (Souter even restores επιτιμων for επιτιμησαν of the same blundering authorities and W-H.)

Mark

I suppose the Revisers thought *c k* strengthen the **SB** combination here for *αυτοις*, but what of all the others? The Latin side is the important one and all but *c k* are with *D d* for *τοις προσφερουσιν*. How we can expect to proceed on any such unscientific lines I fail to see. Souter's text corrects two trumpety mistakes in this verse of the same Greek group, one of order and one of tense, and then leaves the worst one in the text and the editor gives no authorities below. We shall *never* advance at this rate. Did they not realize when they accused **SB** of bad faith in taking the Lucan *order* for *να αυτων αφηται* that **SB** were looking at the parallels, and hence the further blunder?

I hope to show elsewhere that the Latin of *b d* is the important thing in Mark. And here we throw away the testimony of *DW* and sixteen other uncials, practically all cursives, all Latins but *c k*, the syriacs including *sin*, *goth*, *arm*, and *aeth* in favour of the usual coterie of blind guides. They are only *one*, an entity, and that a critical recension. *Not* the neutral text.

I merely make suggestions elsewhere, but I make free here to demand of the next revisers that *τοις προσφερουσιν* be restored to Mark x. 13. Even *Soden's* text holds it.

(xiv. 69.) Finally here *B* alone adopts the *ειπεν* of *sah boh aeth* for *ηρξατο λεγειν* of absolutely everything else. All *B's* friends desert him and leave him self-accusant of coptic conspiracy. This *ειπεν* in *copt* is the same here as at Matt. xxvi. 71 (where the Greek is *λεγει*). Horner has spoiled my picture in *sah* by quoting *B* for *ηρξατο λεγειν* in error.

xv. 46. *ενειλησεν τη συνδου και εθηκεν (pro κατεθηκεν) αυτον εν μνηματι. NBC<sup>2</sup>DLWΣΑΓ<sup>12</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> 892 Sod<sup>nauc</sup> [non Paris<sup>97</sup>] W-H prefer εθηκεν to κατεθηκεν. εθηκεν is found to be the expression in St. Matthew (xxvii. 60) and St. Luke (xxiii. 53) and this may be classed as harmonistic on the part of **NBC<sup>2</sup>DL**, but it is worse; for why should they deny free speech to St. Mark when the very catacombs at Rome re-echo *κατεθηκεν*! For this expression is found on some early sepulchral tablets in the Christian catacombs, and doubtless St. Mark if writing in Greek wrote *κατεθηκεν* and not *εθηκεν*. [*A* = *καθηκεν*; *Soden* and *Tisch* retain *κατεθηκεν*.]*

### Improvement.

i. 7. *ερχεται ο ισχυροτερος μου οπισω* (—*μου seq*) only *B* and *Orig* 1/2 against all others and against *Origen* close by distinctly *μου οπισω μου*. Hort places this second *μου* in square brackets, but it is quite against the weight of evidence.

The only others to vary are *b l q* which elide the first *μου*, and  $\Delta^1$  273  $\delta ff_2 t$  which leave the first *μου* and elide *οπισω μου*.

- i. 27. *ωστε συνζητειν αυτους* (*pro ωστε συνζ. προς εαυτους rell*) **NB** only *W-H* (*cf. b e ff q - αυτους*) against Paris<sup>97</sup> and the rest. *Sod* has no new witness. *W* has *και συνεζητουν προς εαυτους*, *cf syr*.
  - ii. 18. A question of "pairs" as in Matthew, or rather of triplets. *διατι οι μαθ. Ιωαννου και οι μαθ. των φαρ. νηστεουσιν οι δε σοι (-μαθηται) ου νηστ.* *B* elides the third *μαθηται* (fourth in the verse) with only two cursives (127 and 2<sup>pe</sup>) and most mss of the *bohairic*; so [*W-H*]. *Tisch* does not record this for *boh* and *Horner* forgets to put it in his *sah* apparatus.
  23. *οδοποιειν* (*pro οδον ποιειν*) BGH 1 372 892 *Sod*<sup>pauc</sup> (*Om W, habens τιλλειν pro τιλλοντες*).
  - iii. 6. *συμβουλιον εδιδουν* (*pro συμβ. εποιουν vel εποιησαν*) BL *fam* 13 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *boh*<sup>trcs</sup> *Sod*<sup>243</sup> *et txt*, against Paris<sup>97</sup> and *d εποιουν* with the mass, against *εποιουντο W Sod*<sup>1222</sup>, against *εποιησαν NCA Sod*<sup>550</sup> *boh*<sup>pl</sup> *sah*, and against *D<sup>sr</sup>* and *a ποιουντες*.
  33. *-μου fin* *BD<sup>sr</sup> arm?* *W-H* only [*contra d rell omn et verss*] This is another question of "pairs" where we have so often found *B* guilty before. It is quite natural. The phrase is *τις εστιν η μητηρ μου και οι αδελφοι μου*, witnessed to by all other Greeks (but *W*, see below), all Latins and *syr copt aeth*. *Ambrose* 1/2 and *Aug* agree (*libere*) with *BD<sup>sr</sup>*, and *W* goes further and elides *μου* after *μητηρ* retaining it after *αδελφοι*, thus giving the lie direct to *BD<sup>sr</sup>*, although not as usual wholly supporting the Latins. Westcott and Hort adopt the omission of *BD<sup>sr</sup>* just because *B* and *D<sup>sr</sup>* happen to agree. It is wholly unscientific, because small *d* is supported by all others. *Soden* avoids this.
  - iv. 28. *ειτεν* (*pro ειτα*) *bis* BLΔ *W-H*. Ionic form. **N** has *ειτεν sec.* (but omits *ειτα σταχυν* altogether). **N<sup>c</sup>** inserts *ειτα σταχυν* but allows *ειτεν πλ.* following to stand.
  38. For "*και ην αυτος επι τη πρυμνη επι το προσκεφαλαιον καθευδων*" **NABCDLΔW** *fam* 1 *fam* 13 17 28 53 61 77 116 273 604 892 *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>3015</sup> *Eust* 48 222 *semel it vg etc.* would substitute *εν* for the first *επι*: "in puppi." But can we conceive that a revision would put in this *επι*? Rather is it the hand of revision which removes this *επι* so as to have but one *επι* in the sentence, and substitutes *εν* for the first. This seems logical. I assume here a *Greek* original. If we assume a *Latin* original, then the matter simply is a question of two recensions or translations. *Soden* prints *έν* as *W-H*.
- The *sah* here is a little picturesquely amplified, while *boh* expresses *επι* (or *εν*) *τη πρυμνη* by one word *ὑποφω* "behind," "retro."

Mark

See Wetstein *ad loc.* quoting Hom. Od. "...επ' ικριοφιν γλαφυρης ινα νηγρετον ευδοι πρυμνης." Cf Liddell and Scott under *ικρια* and Homer Od. iii. 353.

- v. 27. ακουσασα τα περι του ιω **N**\*BC\*Δ *Evst* 33 *W-H* [*non Sod*]. Either due to retranslation, improvement, or from ΑΚΟΥΣΑCΑΠΕΡΙ.  
 36. παρακουσας (*pro ακουσας*) **N**\*<sup>et eb</sup> BLΔ<sup>gr</sup> *et W* 892\* ? *e* (*contra rell omn et latt rell omn copt syr*). This must be a "nicety," as rendered by *e* "Ih̄s autem *neglexit* sermonem," referring to the previous verse where the messengers report that the daughter is dead and add "Why dost thou trouble the Teacher?" *Sod* follows *Hort* and *Tisch*, but adds 2<sup>pe</sup> [*contra Cronin*].

All Latins oppose with D, but *e* joining W and **NBL**Δ shows the hand of revision.

As Dr. Scrivener comments on this in his 'Plain Introduction' I will add here the other two examples in St. Mark which he discusses:

- x. 16. κατευλογει **NBC**Δ *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 892, κατηυλογει LNΨ Paris<sup>97</sup> *y*<sup>scr</sup> *P*<sup>scr</sup> (*pro ευλογει (ηυλογει ΓΣΦ* 28 *al.*) **ADEHK**\*MSUVXII *et W minn, ευλογησεν FGK*<sup>2</sup> *e*<sup>s:r</sup> *u*<sup>scr</sup> *z*<sup>scr</sup> *Sod*<sup>alio</sup>) I give the evidence in full. Scrivener did not know of NWΣΦΨ or Paris<sup>97</sup>. (*Latt* = benedicebat). *Soden* prints κατευλογει.  
 xii. 17. εξεθauμαζον **NB**Ψ *b W-H Sod*, εθauμαζον D<sup>2</sup>LA *Sod*<sup>750</sup> *al.* 2 2<sup>pe</sup> Laura<sup>A</sup> 104 892 *latt boh* (εθauμαζοντο D\*), εθauμασαν ACNXΓΠ *al. unc*<sup>9</sup> *et WΣΦ al. pl. k sah*. I add here the evidence of WΣΦ and Ψ unknown to Dr. Scrivener. 604 and Paris<sup>97</sup> read εθauμασαν.

Now hear Dr. Scrivener:

"παρακουσας, 'overhearing,' instead of ακουσας, may be deemed probable on the evidence of **N**\*BLΔ and the Latin *e*, which must have had the reading, though it mistranslated *neglexit*." (A note to this observes that Lucian certainly gives the word this meaning.) "We gladly credit the same group (**NBCL**Δ 473† *Evst* 150 259) with another rare compound κατευλογει in x. 16 whose intensive force is very excellent. In xii. 17 a similar compound εξεθauμαζον is too feebly vouched for by **NB** alone."

Thus Dr. Scrivener. I cannot agree with him. This is very old-fashioned criticism and neglects the force of the grouping. As a matter of fact the last illustration is rather better attested than the others in a way, because an independent enters in, in the person of the Latin ms *b*, which by adding *vehementer* to *mirabantur*, alone among Latins, provides the force of εξεθauμαζον. The Latins also give us the imperfect. If I am correct as to *b* being the most important base key of the whole Old Latin in St. Mark, this is a most serious place, as showing (if *b* has not been revised here on an Old Greek like **NB**) that **NB**Ψ got εξεθauμαζον when translating a Latin like *b*, or using a Greek base the counterpart of *b*.†

† But 473 (2<sup>pe</sup>) is wrong.

† *c ff*<sub>2</sub> use *admirabantur*, *k admirati sunt*, but the others *mirabantur*.

Now as to the other two places. Dr. Scrivener favours *παρακουσας* supported by  $\aleph^{et\ ch}$  BL $\Delta^{ex}$  and W *e*, and *κατευλογει* supported by  $\aleph$ BC $\Delta$  (LN $\Psi$  Paris<sup>87</sup> y<sup>scr</sup> P<sup>scr</sup>). I believe, on the contrary, that this is either pure revision ("improvement") or is to be accounted for by translating into Greek, at any rate in the second place "*benedicebat*." The reason is this. Why should "Antioch" or any other revision have sought to displace *παρακουσας* and *κατευλογει* if they were such good expressions that they commend themselves to the critic as having intensive force? Is it reasonable, is it probable, is it possible that all the other recensions and documents *cast out* these good intensive expressions? Where are the 1 family, the 13 family, and 28 and 33 and 157, 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604 and others usually so friendly? To support the theory of *παρακουσας* and *κατευλογει* being original and basic, we must do this: we must accuse 33 of having come to this place† and having deliberately rejected these good readings. We must similarly accuse *fam* 1 *fam* 13 in their entirety of the same course. We must accuse 28 (sister of W) of having seen *παρακουσας* and *κατευλογει* and of having rejected them. Similarly we must accuse 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604 of the same proceeding. I wish to state this matter thus, once for all. It has not been put to us thus before, but daily and hourly for years I have been confronted with this proposition, and it is this which causes me to write this whole essay on  $\aleph$ B.

Cursive mss, most friendly otherwise, desert the revisers of Egypt just when they should be expected to support them in "good" "plausible" or "improving" readings. And it is this which causes me to believe that the boot is entirely on the other foot and that what we have been taught were revisions at Antioch or elsewhere are nothing of the sort, but that it is the beloved group  $\aleph$ BCL, + $\Delta$  in St. Mark and  $\Psi$ , which come from the same parent-revisor of the "true" text. They sought to improve.

It was old-fashioned and unscientific of Dr. Scrivener to welcome *e* as strengthening the cause of the small group (which is simply an integer recopied) for *παρακουσας*, although W<sup>ex</sup> now upholds, because, as I have shown, W *e* are simply *one*, and because *e* is away from all other Latin support here. Similarly *κατευλογει* is not strengthened by  $\Psi$  Paris<sup>97</sup> particularly. It merely indicates that these mss found this in their exemplars (of the same stem exactly as  $\aleph$ B) and if they found this here *why should they not also be truthfully copying* when they do not reproduce other doubtful things which we find in  $\aleph$ B? That is the question. And that is why the mss junior to  $\aleph$ B in years, but of the same parentage, should be useful to us in checking the traditional text, and not by casting away their check when it displeases us, lead to the perpetuation of erroneous readings or renderings in  $\aleph$ B.

---

† 33 is wanting at x. 16, but extant at xii. 17.



*As to Paris<sup>97</sup>.*

Thus Paris<sup>97</sup> does *not* read *παρακουσας* in v. 36. I subjoin a comparison of some readings of Paris<sup>97</sup> in this same chapter (verses 1/13) to show exactly how Paris<sup>97</sup> stands compared to **N** and B.

Mark

v. i. γεργεσηνων	Paris <sup>97</sup>	LUΔ etc	(γερασσηνων <b>NBD</b> )
2. εξελθοντος αυτου	,,	<b>NBCLΔ</b> 892	
υπηνητησεν	,,	<b>NBCDGLΔ</b>	
3. μνημασιν	,,	<b>NB plur</b>	(μνημειοις DH <i>al.</i> )
αλυσεσιν	,,	<b>N plur</b>	(αλυσει BCLW)
ουκετι ουδεις	,,	<b>NBCDLΔ</b> 892	
4. δια το αυτον πολλ.	,,	B <i>plur</i>	(δι αυτον πολλ. <b>N</b> , δια το πολλ. W, οτι πολλ. αυτον D)
6. και ιδων	,,	<b>NBCLΔ</b> 892	
προσεκ. αυτω	,,	<b>ND plur</b>	(πρ. αυτον BACLΔ)
8. ελεγεν γαρ	,,	B <i>plur</i>	(και ελεγεν <b>N</b> )
9. ονομα μοι	,,	<b>N plur</b>	(+εστιν B)
10. αποστειλη αυτους	,,	AM <i>al.</i>	(αυτους απ. D <sup>gr</sup> EFGHSU, αυτα αποστ. BCD, αυτον αποστ. <b>NL</b> , αποστ. αυτον KII, — αυτους 892)
13. εισηλθον	,,	<b>N plur</b>	(εισηλθεν B <sup>710</sup> Sod <sup>tres</sup> )
ησαν δε ως διςχιλ	,,	A <i>unc</i> <sup>12</sup>	(om ησαν δε <b>NBCDLΔ</b> 892)
and so it runs to			
36. ακουσας	Paris <sup>97</sup>	<i>plur et</i> 892 <i>ex emend</i>	(παρακουσας <b>NBLWΔ e</b> )

*Improvement (continued).*

Mk. vi. 24. του βαπτιζοντος **NBLΔ<sup>gr</sup>** Sod<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> W-H Sod against all the rest (and 28, Scholz misled Tisch as to 28) του βαπτιστου and W as *copt* and *latt*.

It is difficult in Mark to know where to class this. It may be due to retranslation. If "foundation" on the part of **NBLΔ<sup>gr</sup>** then how did all the rest get του βαπτιστου? But if the Latin *baptistae* was original, then we can see **NBLΔ<sup>gr</sup>** translating independently of DW and the rest.

25 *fin.* Of course the Latin remains constant here with *baptistae*. L repeats του βαπτιζοντος, but **NBΔ** 2<sup>pe</sup> here go with the rest for του βαπτιστου while it is 604 and 892 which go alone to join L here.

51 *fin.* εξισταντο (*pro* εξισταντο και εθαυμαζον) **NBLΔΔ\*** (*fam* 1) 28 [*non* 604 *non* Paris<sup>97</sup>] 892 *copt c ff<sub>2</sub> i l δ vg syr sin W-H Sod*.

This is seeking to remove a conflation and is a very interesting example. Various proof offers as to this. In the first place both D and W with the rest hold the double expression.

*d* is strengthened by *b q f r syr<sup>pesh</sup> arm aeth* (*a* adds *cum admiratione*). Further the 1 family substitute *ἐξέπλησσοντο* for *ἐξίσταντο* while cancelling *καὶ θαυμάζον*, showing what they were driving at, and, may I ask, *why* should all other Greeks conflate including Paris<sup>97</sup>? This ms has been consistently following the fortunes of **NB** in this chapter (against **D** 2<sup>pe</sup> *rell*) but now deliberately says that this is *not* a conflation, but is original. Nor is it imported in any way from St. Matthew. The "conflation" was undone by **NBLΔ** in my opinion as an "improvement," and upon reference to John vi. 19 where *καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν* is the expression. Finally note that 2<sup>pe</sup>, like the 1 family, was exercised here, and while omitting *λιαν* earlier in the verse, finishes thus: *ἐξίσταντο καὶ θαυμάζον λιαν ἐν εαυτοῖς*.

- vii. 4. *ραντισσονται* **NB** 40 53 71 86 179 237 240 244 259 *sah Euthym W-H* instead of *βαπτισσονται* **D** *rell* and **W** with the important minuscules and *latt*. In *Apoc* xix. 13 **N\*** and **N<sup>c</sup>** with **P** favour "sprinkling" as against *βεβαμμενον*. of most, but there *Hipp* and the Latins are with them. Here in Mark the character of the cursives suggests distinctly that the change was made by **NB**, and not by the others. Not only do **DW** *rell* oppose, but *fam* 1 13 28 157 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 892 and even Paris<sup>97</sup> have *βαπτισσονται*. This is the more important as to the latter because immediately following *Sod*<sup>1442</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> alone with **B** write *ἀπερ ἐλαβον* for *α παρελαβον* showing the **B** base in this detail and contradicting *ραντισσονται*. Cf. Merx, p. 70, *ad loc.* 'deren schlimmste und sachlich ganz verkehrte in **NB**.'

15. *-εκεινα* **NBLΔ** *Sod*<sup>1050</sup> *φ<sup>a</sup>* 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *Evst* 48 49 *boh* (against *sah* and the rest of Greeks and all Latins). This seems a distinct effort to remove a superfluous word, which no doubt from the testimony of **DW** *etc.* is basic. Cf. Paris<sup>97</sup> which goes further and elides *εστιν*, writing "*τα κοινουντα τον ανθρωπον*" (almost the antithesis of **B**'s unique *το κοινουν αυτον* above, which Paris<sup>97</sup> does not adopt). *Soden* omits *εκεινα*.

- viii. 9. *-οι φαγοντες* **NBLΔ** *Sod*<sup>φ<sup>a</sup></sup> *exc* 1454 *Γ* 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Evst*<sup>a</sup> 18 19 49 150 *sa<sup>h</sup>unus?* *boh*<sup>tres</sup>. The same group approximately as above, although a whole chapter further on. There is no particular reason for adding *οι φαγοντες* (which all the rest and **DW** have) but there is a possible "nicety" involved in removing the words as unnecessary. *Sod*<sup>xt</sup> omits.

25. *εθηκεν τας χειρας επι*, for *επεθηκεν τας χειρας επι* only by **BL** 892 *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> against all else (if we except *syr copt*) and all Latins *inposuit* (or *inponens* as *a* with **D**<sup>gr</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *επιθεις*). This seems to be from a desire to avoid the double *επι*. If *εθηκεν . . . επι* were original, *why* should a revision strive for pleonasm by changing *εθηκεν* to *επεθηκεν*? *Soden* refuses *εθηκεν*.

Mark

- ix. 29. — *και νηστεια* **NB** *k Clem W-H* [*non Sod*] against everything else as well as the new **WΣΦ** and even **Ψ** and **Paris**<sup>97</sup> and 892. Cf. Merx, pp. 103/4.

[*k* has “in orationibus” not “in oratione” for *εν προσευχη*, but so have *b q* and *r d* (*contra D*<sup>87</sup>) “in orationibus et jejuniis,” and *i vg*<sup>T</sup> “in orationibus et jejunio.”]

The syriacs (with *boh*<sup>r</sup> *arm aeth*) give “fasting” the place of honour, reading *εν νηστεια και προσευχη*.

41. *εν ονοματι μου οτι χριστου εστε*. No less than **ABC\*KLNP\*** and **ΣΦΨ** 1 [*non fam*] 892 **Paris**<sup>97</sup> **Laura**<sup>A104</sup> and eight other cursives + five of *Sod* remove this *μου*. Tischendorf says “*vdtr propter pleonasmum omissum esse; si quis intulisset μου, eiecisset opinor οτι χυ εστε*.” He found that **N** not only held *μου*, but substituted *εμου* for *χριστου* afterwards, reading “*εν ονοματι μου οτι εμου εσται*,” hence he was trying to account for the absence of *μου* in **B**. His explanation is quite possible, for all Latins have *meo* and *quia χρι estis* (only *ff*<sub>2</sub> substitutes *Dñi* for *χρι* and *k* suppresses *estis*) and if we regard the Latin as a whole to be basic we must come to the same conclusion. In other words it is a smoothing away of a supposed difficulty.

- xi. 17. *και εδιδασκεν και ελεγεν* **NBCLΔΨ** 6 *fam* 13 *k δ boh* (*aeth*) (*syr*) *Orig W-H & Sod txt*.

This I believe to be another clear case of improvement by “pairs.”† For sixteen verses we have had much disagreement, but the Latins have been more or less divided. Here they rise in a body and with *sah* (against *boh*) they contradict the group **NBCLΔΨ** *Orig W-H Sod*, and have with all other Greeks, including **WΣΦ** 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 **Paris**<sup>97</sup> and **Laura**<sup>A104</sup>, *και εδιδασκεν λεγων*.

In xi. 1–16 *Orig* and **NB** have been much divided but here they conspire together.

- ibid*. This is followed closely by *πεποινηκατε* by **BLΔΨ** *Orig W-H Sod* only. The **LXX** quotation, as pointed out in the notes on Matthew, does not lend itself to any particular form of the verb. But nearly all Greeks use *εποιησατε* here, including the Latinisers 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604 and the friends of **NB**, *viz Sod*<sup>1050</sup> 892 **Paris**<sup>97</sup> and **Laura**<sup>A104</sup>, and if *πεποινηκατε* had been basic why should all change, for the aorist is hardly an improvement here?

24. Within seven verses we here get another illustration of improvement by “pairs.”

*οσα προσευχεσθε και αιτεισθε* **NBCDLΔΨ** 892 **Paris**<sup>97</sup>

**Laura**<sup>A104</sup> [*non al. Sod*] *a c d ff*<sub>2</sub> *k syr Cypr W-H & Sod txt*.

*οσα προσευχομενοι αιτεισθε* *A unc rell*<sup>12</sup> *et WΣΦ minn rell omn vid b et latt rell*.

† As a matter of fact **Δ** repeats the performance in verse 18, writing *και ηκουον... και εξητουν* for *και ηκουσαν... και εξητουν*.

The three cursives seem to be the only supporters of the five uncials with **NB**. *D d* of course lend support, but in view of the other arguments against such "pairs" *D d* may have followed the "improvement" here, which *W<sup>st</sup>* and *b*, two equally good witnesses, take pains to contradict. Besides, if *προσευχασθε και αιτεισθε* were fundamental, *why* should a revision change to *προσευχόμενοι αιτεισθε*? Whenever a copula has to be added to make such a change it is suspicious. (*Sah boh* here do not help to recover the original reading). If I submitted this without the one at xi. 17, the correctness of the inference might well be impugned. Kindly consider the two matters *together* and then the addition of *D d* may not be considered so weighty in the second place. (*Sod*<sup>050</sup> abstains.)

Besides, consider *Origen*<sup>lib 3.650</sup> *εαν στηκητε προσευχόμενοι πιστεύετε οτι λαμβάνετε και ληψέσθε*, thus merging 24/25 but implying a probable antagonism to **NB**.

- xii. 24 *init.* *εφη αυτοις ο ιησους* **NBCLΔΨ** 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> *et Sod*<sup>txt</sup> *sah boh syr pesh* [contra *syr sin*]

This is the "shorter" text. Such introductions have occurred several times already in this Gospel (and see below xii. 29). I have hesitated to brand them as "improvements" in deference to the shorter text. But here *Origen*<sup>3.825</sup> (with the rest of the Greeks and all the Latins) comes to say that *αποκριθεις ο ιησους ειπεν (αυτοις)* is the *Marcan* text. Therefore the previous passages involving this "cutting" (generally with *copt*) must be viewed with suspicion. The group itself is plainly self-accusant of a special line of work, and as it would appear editorial, some time back in the third century. Consider xii. 27 *fin* again the "shorter" text "*πολυ πλανασθε*" **NBCLWΔΨ** 892\* *Sod*<sup>1354 1443</sup> *k sah boh* against all others (even 33 and Paris<sup>97</sup> oppose) and we see the same group at work. For the others including *syr pesh* have the longer expression.

37. Out of six varying orders **BLT**<sup>d</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> 892 *Sod*<sup>050 1443</sup> *et txt* elect to use *αυτου εστιν υιος*. Cf remarks on "Genitive before the noun" in Luke. Here in Mark the possessive precedes the noun according to coptic usage but the verb comes last: *αυτου υιος εστιν* by *sah boh* and 179 7<sup>pe</sup> *goth*, so that (taking into consideration *υιος αυτου εστιν* of **N** *vell pl.* and *b*, and *εστιν υιος αυτου* of *D d it*<sup>pl</sup>, and *εστιν αυτου υιος* of **Δ k δ**) the order of **BLT**<sup>d</sup> seems to be a grammatical preference combined with coptic.

- xiii. 15. *-εις την οικιαν* **NBLΨ** 245 *Sod*<sup>7337 3015</sup> *c k sah boh* [*non aeth*] *syr pesh* [*non sin*] *W-H* [*non Sod*]

This I think is a clear case of improvement. It is opposed by *D* and all the rest, including not only *W* 28 and the minuscules (2<sup>pe</sup> only has the shortened clause "*και ο επι του*

δωματος μη καταβατω εις την οικιαν αυτου'') but by 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> and Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *syr sin* and all the other non-Egyptian Latins, *arm* and *aeth*. The reason is to avoid Mark's characteristic pleonastic touch, for he undoubtedly wrote: ο δε (or και ο D *it*<sup>pl</sup>) επι του δωματος μη καταβατω εις την οικιαν μηδε εισελθατω αραι τι εκ της οικιας αυτου. The compiler of the **NBLP** recension seems to have forgotten Mark's method. See below again at xiv. 19. This will be a good place to exhibit it.

*Mark's Diction.*

I take the liberty of extracting from Sir John Hawkins' list some of the longer expressions in St. Mark's synoptic diction.† They are very interesting as showing on the one hand semitic pleonasm (and no doubt more true to life than the shortened forms in St. Matthew <sup>and</sup> St. Luke) and on the other a kind of *Roman rhetoric* which Mark may have imbibed amid Roman surroundings.

Mark

- i. 32. οψιας δε γενομενης οτε εδν (εδυσεν) ο ηλιος
- 42. απηλθεν απ αυτου η λεπρα και εκαθερισθη
- 45. κηρυσσειν πολλα και διαφημιζειν τον λογον
- ii. 20. τοτε νηστεουσιν εν εκεινη τη ημερα
- 25. χρεian εσχεν και επεινασεν
- iii. 26. ου δυναται σταθηναι αλλα τελος εχει
- iv. 5. επι το πετρωδες (vel επι τα πετρωδη) και ουκ ειχεν γην πολλην
- 8. καρπον αναβαινοντα και αυξανοντα (vel αυξανομενον)
- 21. υπο τον μοδιον τεθη η υπο την κλινην
- 39. εκοπασεν ο ανεμος και εγενετο γαληνη μεγαλη
- v. 19. εις τον οικον σου προς τους σους
- ibid.* οσα ο κυριος σοι πεποιηκεν και ηλησεν σε
- 23. ινα σωθη και ζηση
- 26. και μηδεν ωφεληθεισα αλλα μαλλον εις το χειρον ελθουσα
- 33. φοβηθεισα και τρεμουσα
- 39. τι θορυβεισθε και (τι) κλαιετε
- vi. 4. και εν τοις συγγενουσιν αυτου και εν τη οικια αυτου
- vii. 21. εσωθεν. .εκ της καρδιας
- viii. 17. ουπω νοειτε ουδε συνιετε
- ix. 2. κατιδιαν μονους
- 12. ινα πολλα παθη και εξουθενωθη
- 35. εσται παντων εσχατος και παντων διακονος
- x. 22. στυγνασας. .λυπουμενος
- 30. νυν εν τω καιρω τουτω

† Pp. 139/141. I have modified some passages slightly to embrace some **ms** evidence, and excluded others where the **mss** vary.

Mark

- xii. 44. *παντα οσα ειχεν . . ολον τον βιον*  
 xiii. 28. *απαλος γενηται και εκφυη τα φυλλα*  
     29. *εγγυς εστιν επι θυραις* (and Matthew, not Luke)  
 xiv. 1. *το πασχα και τα αζυμα* (Compare Luke)  
     6. *αφετε αυτην · τι αυτη κοπους παρεχετε*  
     15. *εστρωμενον ετοιμον* (Some Latins and *Orig* expand further.)  
     30. *σημερον ταυτη τη νυκτι*  
     61. *εσιωπα και ουκ απεκρινατο ουδεν* (*vel* και ουδεν απεκρ.)†  
 xv. 21. *παραγοντα . . ερχομενον απ' αγρου*  
     32. *ινα ιδωμεν και πιστευσωμεν* (αυτω)  
     42. *επει ην παρασκευη ο εστιν προσαββατον* (*vel* προς σαββ. *vel* πριν σαββ.)  
 xvi. 2. (λιαν) *πρωι . . (ετι) ανατειλαντος του ηλιου*  
     [Add xiii. 15, xiv. 19.]

*Improvement (continued).*

Mark

- xiii. 35. *η οψε η μεσ.* (*pro* οψε η μεσ.) **NBCLΔ<sup>sr</sup>Ψ** 892 *Sod*<sup>7050 369 fam φα</sup>  
     *et Sod*<sup>ext</sup> *k ? sah boh aeth*

The first *η* is an addition by these authorities to make the double "pair" † against all else, and **WΣΦ** *Origen*<sup>3.339</sup> and *Orig*<sup>int 3.877</sup>

In this we cannot tell whether the *sahidic* got it from these six Greeks or the Greeks from the *sahidic*, as in *sah* the expression is literally the same: *η . . η*; in *boh* it is *ει . . ει*.

To xiii. 15 now add xiv. 19 *fin.* where *και αλλος μητι εγω* is omitted by **NBCLPΔ et W** [*non* 28] **Ψ** *min aliq g<sub>2</sub> l δ vg sah boh syr aeth.* This looks like a strong combination, but for the clause are ranged **DAW<sup>b</sup>XΓΠ unc<sup>8</sup> et ΣΦ**, all the important *minn* including *fam* 1 *fam* 13 (both in their entirety) 28 [*hiat* 33] 157 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 892 *Laura*<sup>A 104</sup> *etc* (and *Paris*<sup>97</sup>, the latter apparently having *και ο αλλος* without *μητι εγω sec*) § *a* (*mut b*) *d f* (*mut goth*) *ff<sub>2</sub> i k q* (*mut r*) *Orig*, and *it is decidedly in Mark's manner*. Absent in Matthew it may well have been thought redundant here and early removed. As Sir John Hawkins' book is based on Westcott and Hort's text he naturally does not have on his list this place or xiii. 15. The full context here at xiv. 19 is: "(και *vel* οι δε) ηρξαντο λυπεισθαι και λεγειν αυτω εις κατα (*vel* καθ) εις μητι εγω και αλλος μητι εγω." It is this *και αλλος μητι εγω* which the *itala* supports with **D unc<sup>15</sup> minn longe pl** and *Origen* against the Egyptian coterie of uncials plus a few scattering

† *απεκριθη* of **D** is a form no doubt later than the second century. See Moulton's review of Thackeray's *Grammar of Old Testament Greek* in *J.T.S.* January 1910, pp. 299/300.

‡ "η οψε η μεσ., η αλεκτρ. η πρωι" instead of "οψε η μεσ. η αλεκτρ. η πρωι."

§ *Cf c* in peculiar manner inverting: "nunquid ego aut alius hoc singuli coeperunt dicere."

cursives (see below) and *sah boh syr aeth* [not arm apparently]. To the previous evidence for omission we have now to add W, but given its Egyptian environment this witness has not here a very grave importance, and 28, its sister, contradicts it. It seems almost incredible that this very pleonastic clause should have been *added*, but very natural that it should have been subtracted as quite *redundant*. We are however doing violence to Mark's own distinct method (as exhibited above) if we elide the words, and *Origen* is a witness here *for* the words <sup>4.436</sup> distinctly Marcan (ο δε μαρκος οτι ηρξαντο λυπεισθαι και λεγειν αυτω εις καθ ενα....) but *Origen* is here put out of court by the critics because he fails to uphold the doctrine of codices otherwise sympathetic. Thus we are up against a wall of prejudice which has forced the critics to follow certain rules involving the impeccability of certain witnesses. The addition here is absolutely Mark-like and I believe in D and the *itala* with *Origen* against the other versions and *NBW etc.* This is practically a key place as to how much force such a strong grouping for omission should exercise. And we cannot consider it apart from Mark's habitual manner. *Soden* does not omit, although retention stultifies his other readings with the same group.

*Tisch* claims *min*<sup>20</sup> for omission, but I doubt if there be as many. Among them are 17 106 131? 218 s<sup>scr</sup> *Evst* 7 9 10 12 14 17 36. Thus none of Matthaëi's codices and only one of Scrivener's. *Soden* adds five.

Finally consider the Latin expressions for εις καθ' εις (εις κατα εις *NBLA* [non W] Ψ 892; Beza εις κ̃α̃τα [= και ειτα] εις; εις εκαστος C; εις παρ εις 244; εις καθ' ενα *Orig*) for there is quite a difference between *singillatim* of *vg g<sub>2</sub> l*, and *singuli* of the principal *vett.* The *singuli* allows of *numquid ego* with the addition *et alius numquid ego*, while *singillatim* assumes the stop after *numquid ego* without further addition as if when Jerome was translating his Greek he adopted this on purpose, not proposing to amplify the clause.

*k* indeed transfers *singulis* to the end after the double clause, thus: "Illi autem coeperunt contristari et dicunt illi numquid ego alius numquit ego singulis." Observe *c*, cited above.

Mark

xiv. 29. Indeed it is a question whether Mark's pleonastic manner has not been pruned at this place also. For ει και παντες σκανδαλισθησονται αλλ ουκ εγω there is added by D *d ff<sub>2</sub> q r?* *vg<sup>G</sup>* ου σκανδαλισθησομαι. And to this witness now add (*teste Buchanan*) *b*: *numquam scandalizabor*, exactly as (*teste Horner*) the *sah ms<sup>m1</sup>*.

36 *fin.* Or at this place, where to: αλλ ου τι εγω θελω (or αλλ ουχ ο εγω θελω D) αλλα τι συ (or αλλ ο συ D) there is found the addition of *θελεις* in D *Sod*<sup>750</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> † *c<sup>cr</sup>* *a b c d f ff<sub>2</sub>* (*hiat i*)

Mark

$g_2 q$  ( $r$ ?) *vg*<sup>LR</sup> *sah boh arm aeth.* It is rather curious that the coptics add, but not **NB** *rell gr* nor *W*. Buchanan now adds *b* to all these other Latins.

- xv. 46 *init.* Or indeed here, where all Latins have  $\omicron \delta \epsilon \omega \sigma \eta \phi$  (following  $\tau \omega \omega \sigma \eta \phi$  *ver* 45 *fin*) with  $D\Sigma$  [*hiant*  $N\Phi$ ] *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> and a very few cursives against all Greek uncials and *W*. It is quite possible that the first Latin draft of Mark contained this, and that it was removed in the first Greek as rather unnecessary and *και* substituted. At any rate it is very peculiar to find such a clash of arms as occurs here when all Greeks and *W* are for *και* against all Latins and  $D\Sigma$  *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 38 106 435 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>1222</sup>  $\delta$  398 for  $\omicron \delta \epsilon \omega \sigma \eta \phi$  (*n syr*<sup>pesh</sup> hier *B και ω σ η φ*) especially as in the previous verse *W* is with  $D$  1 124 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>1337</sup> substituting *πα ρ α του κεν τυ ρ ι ω ν ο ς* for *α πο του κεν τυ ρ ι ω ν ο ς*, and yet here opposes. And in verse 46 again goes with  $D d$  (2<sup>pe</sup>) alone for *εις την σινδωνα* (*pro τη σινδονι*).

Consider also xi. 11 *ο φ ι α ς ου σ η ς* (*-της ω ρ α ς*) by *B* alone. *Cf.* John xx. 19 *ου σ η ς ο υ ν ο φ ι α ς* and Thueyd. (i. 50) *η δ η δε η ν ο ψ ε*.

And Mark xiv. 3 of the contents of the alabaster box :

*κα τε χ ε ε ν α υ τ ο υ κα τα της κε φα λ η ς.* This *κα τα* is removed by **NBCWΔ**  $\delta$  1 [*non* 118–209] 28 435 892 *Sod*<sup>duob</sup>: *et Sod*<sup>txt</sup> (*k*: *et perfudit cum a capite*). *ε πι* is substituted by *D Evst* 20 *sah boh* (*syr*) *it*, but *Arrian* (quoted by Wetstein) supports the N.T. use: “*βα λε ε λα δι ο ν παι δια ρ ι ο ν ει ς το βα λα νει ο ν, ε βα λ ο ν αν γ α ρ ι ο ν, και απ ε λ θ ω ν κα τα της κε φα λ η ς α υ τ ο υ κα τε χ ε ο ν.*”

- xiv. 38. “*π ρ ο α ευ χ ε σ θ ε ι να μη ει σε λ θ η τε ει ς πει ρ α σ μ ο ν.*” **N\*B** 13–346–556 *Sod*<sup>1033</sup> and *q* are for making it *π ρ. ι να μη ε λ θ η τε ει ς πει ρ α σ μ ο ν* to remove the double *εις*. *Sod* follows **NB** and *W-H* here.

The other 21 Greek uncials, including **CDLΔ** and  $\Psi$ <sup>712</sup> and *W* as well as the great cursives and 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup>, are all against **NB**, while 69–124 give the lie to 13–346–556 of this family. When the **NBCLΔΨ** family (for it is a family of uncials in Mark just as much as *fam* 13 of cursives) is divided, and only two of its members, **NB**, go apart, and **CLΔΨ**, four of its members, join the great majority, why should we favour **NB**? Consider for a moment, if *ε λ θ η τε* were original, why change to *ει σε λ θ η τε* and invite the pleonasm? The answer would be that all these 21 Greek uncials have been accommodated to Matthew and Luke, where we read *ει σε λ θ η τε ει ς πει ρ α σ μ ο ν*! I think the charge here is rather ridiculous, for if so it is a conspiracy of *W* (the contemporary of **NB**) as well as of 20 other uncials and 1,000 cursives. Rather is it that the Greek recension of Mark, as I am trying to point out, is a thing apart and must be reckoned



Mark

with as such, and that here **NB** were merely "improving" *εισελθῃτε εἰς* and do not hold the neutral base against all else.

I have excluded, as a rule, passages which were liable to reaction from synoptic parallels, and only adduce this with some hesitation. See below for confirmation at xvi. 5.

- xv. 36. *τις* (*pro εἰς*) **NBLΔΨ** 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *δ* (*arm*) against all else, all Latins (but *δ*), *sah boh aeth*, and *syr* (although it will bear both interpretations). The above little group is simply an entity deriving from one revising parent. I do not cite it as a special case of improvement, for *εἰς* may have been simply misread as *τις*, but in order to emphasise the basic entity of this group as a whole. Not a "neutral" entity however, as Hort the Revisers and Soden [against all other mss] indicate by placing *τις* in their texts, because all the Latins oppose, except *δ* over *Δ*<sup>sr</sup> of the group.
39. More grave is the omission of *κραξας* here by **NBLΨ** 892 and *copt*. No others. *W*, which has a lacuna xv. 12-38, begins again just before this, and has *κραξας* with all the rest. See my 'Genesis of the Versions,' vol. i. p. 403 *seq* for the explanation. *Δ* avoided this in the eighth century. Hort revived the error in the nineteenth, and *R-V* followed suit, and Souter's edition of 1910 maintains it and Soden also omits. As to *k* that ms merely substitutes *exclamavit* for *ἐξεπνευσεν*.
40. - *ην* **NBL** [*non ΔΨ*] p<sup>scr</sup> 892 *vg* 1/2 *W-H & Sod txt*.  
 + *ην* all the rest and **WΣΨ** Paris<sup>97</sup>, *DΔ* and all Old Latin extant and *vgg*<sup>11+</sup> *boh* (*sah εστι*). As to the Latin Wordsworth remarks "*emendatio Hieronymiana ut videtur ex graeco*" for Amiatinus and ten vulgates omit against the Old Latin.  
 (The *syriacs* and *aeth* omit *εν αὐς ην*).
- xvi. 5. *ελθουσαι* (*pro εισελθουσαι*) Only *B* 127 against all the other Greeks friendly to *B*. This is another case of real "improvement" on account of the *εἰς* following: "*καὶ εισελθουσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον*." See *B* in the other Gospels. Hort places *ελθουσαι* in his margin, obviously liking *B*'s method.

### *Change without Improvement.*

Among many we fasten at once upon xvi. 4. Here we are on firm ground before the famous dispute as to what follows xvi. 8.

- xvi. 4. *ανακεκυλισται* (*pro αποκεκυλισται*) **NBL** *W-H R.V. Sod*. This is of the stone, and appears to represent a mistaken view of the way in which the stone was placed in Jewish burial places. Neither *Δ* nor *Ψ* join **NBL** here, nor *any* minuscules, not even 892 or Paris<sup>97</sup>, while the *itala* mss with *D* (*αποκεκυλισμενον*) all have *revolutum* except *n* = *amotum*. The question is of

rolling *away*, rolling *away from*, not lifting or rolling *up*. To think **NBL** (as Hort and *R.V.*, *Sod* text) represent a "neutral" text because *αποκεκ.* is the expression in Matthew and Luke is to do violence to the whole synoptic problem. The mass of authorities did not accommodate to Matthew and Luke here (against **NBL**) for **Ψ** witnesses against its friends with the rest, but it only proves once more that the textual situation in St. Mark is quite different from that in the other Gospels as regards **NBL**, and the matter of retranslation here in St. Mark *must* be taken into account. Observe the *amotum* of *n.* Under *ανακυλινδεω* or *ανακυλιω* in the Lexicon the significant and only remark is *Alex. κυβερν.* i. 7. Thayer gives also Alexis in Athenag. Lcian. Dion Hal. Plut., but under *αποκυλ.* Josephus and the LXX three times. [See Postscript in Part II. *Tisch* has misreported **N**].

- iv. 8. *αυξανόμενα* (*pro αυξανοντα ΠΣΦ unc<sup>9</sup> vel αυξανομενον ACDLAW*) by **NB** Laura<sup>A 104</sup> only. Even 892 has *αυξανομενον* and Paris<sup>97</sup> *αυξανοντα*. *Om.* 2<sup>pe</sup>.

**NB** would have "*και εδιδου καρπον αναβαινοντα και αυξανόμενα*" which seems simply to be a mistake (even if it does refer to *ἄλλα init.*) which however both Hort and Souter follow. Wiser are Tischendorf and Soden with *αυξανομενον*.

*ἄλλα init.* is read by **NBCLW** 28 33 124 892. Even with *ἄλλα* (*pro αλλο init.*) **CLW** 28 33 124 892 still give us *αυξανομενον* or *αυξανοντα*.

*Opposition to the Rule "Proclivi lectioni praestat ardua."*

- viii. 16. *εχουσιν pro εχομεν*. This is distinctly the *easier* reading. "*και διελογιζοντο προς αλληλους (λεγοντες) οτι αρτους ουκ εχουσιν.*" **NBDW** *fam* 1 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *it<sup>pl</sup>* (*non syr*) omit *λεγοντες*. *εχουσιν* is read by **BW** *fam* 1 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *c g<sub>2</sub> k* (*D ειχαν*), *a b d i q r* non haberent, *ff<sub>2</sub>* haberent *εχομεν* by the rest (*ελαβομεν* Paris<sup>97</sup>) with the Vulgate, while  
*copt* = (*dicentes*) nullus panis iis,  
*syr* = panis non est (*nobis*).

The matter turns on the omission of the word *λεγοντες* and the original Aramaic expression for "have." But when *λεγοντες* is dropped *εχομεν* becomes more difficult. Hence apparently **B** writes *εχουσιν* (followed by *W-H & Sod*) while **N** holds *εχομεν* with the mass, although it omits *λεγοντες* with *sah*, which *boh* and *syr* retain.

- ix. 14. *ελθοντες (pro ελθων)* } **NBLΔWΨ** 892 *k sah arm W-H* [*non Sod!*]  
*ειδον (pro ιδεν)* }

There is a difficulty here, and apparently overcome by the "neutral" text, and hence opposed to the above rule of preferring the harder reading. In the previous verses our Lord discourses with the apostles who had been present at his transfiguration. Then in verse 14 the majority of witnesses read: *καὶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἰδὲν ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοῦ*. . . "He came to the disciples." As verse 13 said "*ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν*" etc, some scribes perhaps jumped to the conclusion that our Lord was speaking to the body of disciples (while the record is of Peter, James and John) and thought *ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς* should be *ἐλθόντες*.

As a matter of fact *syr sin*† says "When *he* came to his disciples *they* saw" . . . using half of the change of **ΝΒΛΔΨ** 892 *k sah arm*, and showing that the difficulty was known and ancient probably before B's day.

The matter may be merely harmonistic (*cf* *Matt* xvii. 14, *Luc* ix. 37).

Other passages bearing on this rule may be found under "Improvement." See ix. 41 etc.

### *Origen and B in conflict.*

To complete the picture of an already composite text in B we must consult *Origen* closely.

Mark

- i. 15. *οτι*                      **Σ c vg<sup>x</sup> Orig syr sin**  
*καὶ λέγων οτι* B etc (Others *λέγων οτι* as AD *unc<sup>9</sup> sah goth*,  
so that B here has the longest text of all with a *b boh*)

35. *ἐννυχα*    **ΝΒCDLΘ<sup>4</sup>W min aliq 28 372 892 etc. W-H &**  
*ἐννυχον* A *unc<sup>11</sup> et ΣΦ et Orig et 2<sup>pe</sup> 604, et ἐννυχιον* Paris<sup>97</sup>  
*al. aliq.*

- iv. 11. *ἐξωθεν*              **BΣΔ soli**  
*ἐξω*                      *Orig<sup>bis</sup> et rell*

12. *μη βλέπωσι*    *Orig et gr pauc. [negl. Orig von Sod]*  
*βλέπωσι*              **ΝΒ rell pl** (W - *βλέπωσι καὶ*. Cf. *syr sin*)

30. *τινι* (*pr loco*)    *Origen plur., sed πως ΝΒCLWΔ 7 28 179 Sod<sup>txt</sup>*  
*ibid. εν τινι* (*sec loco*)    *Origen et ΝΒCLWΔ 7 28 et Sod<sup>txt</sup>.*

This seems to be a question of "pairs" again, for D *al.* change in the second case to *εν ποια*, having *τινι primo loco*. Origen's quotation seems quite important here. *W-H* naturally follow the apparently strong group against Origen.

† Recte vid Burkitt et Merx. Male Lewis Horner.

Mark

- iv. 34 *fin.* ἐπέλυνεν αυτας DW *eff<sub>2</sub> iqr* and Origen (*Om.* ΤΗΡΟΤ *sah* 1/2)  
ἐπέλυνεν παντα NB *rell et rell latt, sah boh, syr aeth*
- vi. 1. ηλθεν *Plur et Origen<sup>dis</sup>* against historic present *ερχεται*  
by NBCLΔ *Sod<sup>050</sup> et txt [non minn]* (*om* *εκειθεν και ηλθεν* W)  
40. κατα NBD 21 *W-H Sod<sup>txt</sup>*, but *ava Rell gr Orig.*  
*ανδρες ρ̄ (pro ava εκατον)* W
45. προαγειν NB *gr plur*  
προαγειν αυτον DNΣΦ *min aliq latt et verss et Orig*
- ibid.* προς βηθσ. NBDW *plur*  
εις βηθσ. *Sod<sup>050</sup> fam 1 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 Orig*
- vii. 24. — και σιδωνος *Orig<sup>dis</sup> et DLΔW Sod<sup>050</sup> 28 2<sup>pe</sup> a b ff<sub>2</sub> i n syr sin hier*  
(Correct Merx p. 75 by adding W *Sod<sup>050</sup> 28 syr hier*, and make  
*Orig: Orig<sup>bis dis</sup>*).  
*Habent* NB *rell et W-H Sod txt.*  
Who is right? *Orig<sup>di erte bis</sup>* and DW 28 *b etc. syr<sup>sin hier</sup>*, or NB ?
- ibid.* εις την οικιαν *Orig et DWΦ Sod<sup>050</sup> 71 179 2<sup>pe</sup> s<sup>scr</sup> al.*  
εις οικιαν NB *plur.*  
(Following this observe *ηθελησεν* NΔ 2<sup>ps</sup> *al<sup>5</sup> Orig* and *ηθελε*  
BDW *rell.* Origen stops at *γνωαι*, but NB *Sod<sup>94</sup>* (alone)  
write *ηδυνασθη* for *ηδυνηθη*).
- viii. 6. An interesting matter occurs here referred to also under  
“Historic present.” While NBD<sup>gr</sup>L 892 *W-H Sod* have  
*παραγγελλει* the rest have *παρηγγειλε* (*παραγγειλας Sod<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup>*).  
Now *Orig<sup>3.510</sup>* says *κακει μεν κελευει τους οχλους ανακλιθηναι η*  
*αναπεσειν επι του χορτου· και γαρ ο λουκας· κατακλινετε αυτους*  
*ανεγραψε, και ο μαρκος· επεταξε, φησιν, αυτοις παντας ανακ-*  
*λιναι· ενθαδε δε ου κελευει αλλα παραγγελλει τω οχλω*  
*ανακλιθηναι...*
- From this it would appear that *Orig* did not say Mark used  
*παραγγελλει*. He merely uses two historic presents to  
explain the matter. If NBL followed this we have a good  
key as to the responsibility of Origen for much that has been  
attributed to the “neutral” base of NBL. [Observe I leave  
D<sup>gr</sup> out, because he is contradicted here by all Latins but *l*  
and five vulgates.] Apparently then *επεταξε* is St. Mark’s word  
according to Origen. This makes a further complication in  
our troubles as to a Latin or Graeco-latin original for Mark.  
*c* and *ff<sub>2</sub>* use *jussit* here, but elsewhere in Mark vi. 27, 39,  
ix. 25, they use *praecipio* with the rest of the Latins for  
*επιτασσω*. At i. 27 on the other hand *imperat* is generally used.  
At any rate we find NB and Origen disagreed here at viii. 6.
12. σημειον επιζητει *Orig* and many with W, against *ζητει σημειον*  
of NBCLΔ.
36. ωφελει NBLWΔ 892 *a n q W-H Sod txt*  
*ωφελησει* All the rest and *Orig* (*ωφεληθησεται* 33 Paris<sup>97</sup>, *cf syr*)

Mark

- viii. 37. *δοι* **N**\*B W-H txt *δω* **N**<sup>c</sup>L Sod<sup>b</sup>.<sup>t</sup>  
*δωσει* Orig *rell omn.*
- ix. 1. *των εστηκοτων ωδε* 1 *sah boh Orig* [cf b de circumstantibus  
*mecum (-hic) b<sup>sol</sup>; -hic i r et d (D<sup>gr</sup>)*]  
*ωδε των εστηκοτων* B (*syr sin aeth*)  
*των ωδε εστ.* **N** al.
- † 2. *+ εν τω προσευχασθαι αυτον* Sod<sup>050</sup> 28 2<sup>pe</sup> c<sup>scr</sup> Orig<sup>dis</sup>  
*+ „ „ „ αυτους* W fam 13  
*Omit* **N**B *rell*
3. *εγενετο* **N**B unc<sup>8</sup> et WΦ Sod<sup>050</sup>  
*εγενοντο* AGKLN<sup>d</sup>VXW<sup>d</sup>ΓΠ et Σ } *γινονται Orig*  
*εγενενοντο* D }
- x. 13. *ινα αφηται αυτων* Longe plur et W Sod<sup>txt</sup> et Orig<sup>dis</sup> “κατα  
*μεν τον ματθαιον ινα τας..κατα δε τον μαρκον, ινα αφηται*  
*αυτων· κατα δε τον λουκαν, ινα αυτων απηται.”*  
*sed ινα αυτων αφηται* **N**BCLΔΨ Sod<sup>050</sup> 124 892 Eust 49 y<sup>scr</sup> al.  
*pauc. et Paris<sup>97</sup> et f δ W-H.* In the light of this, when we meet  
Δ 124 Eust 49 Paris<sup>97</sup> elsewhere with **N**BCL does this inspire  
confidence in them as supporters of **N**B? It merely indicates  
a similar text faithfully copied, but the group is to be treated  
as one eclectic group, not as a tenfold authority. They stole  
the Lucan order here and created a hiatus in Mark to do it.  
And we know they did this, for they substitute *αυτοις* of Luke  
and Matthew (see under “Harmonistic”) for *τοις προσφερουσιν*  
of the great majority of authorities at the end of this very verse.
20. *εφυλαξα* AD 28 892 Clem Orig  
*εφυλαξαμην* **N**B *rell* (*εποιησα* 1 2<sup>pe</sup> Sod<sup>1337</sup> *syr sin*)
29. *η μητερα η πατερα* BCΔWΦ Sod<sup>050</sup> al. pc. et txt. Boh sah 1/2  
*η πατερα η μητερα* **N** *rell et Ψ Orig<sup>int dis</sup>* *quamvis Marcus*  
*...cum dicit qui dim. patrem et matrem...*
35. *οι δυο υιοι* BC Paris<sup>97</sup> sah boh aeth. No others,  
not even Ψ, and Orig with **N** and the rest flout the proposed  
addition. (Soden however quotes Origen for it.)
46. *ερχεται (pro ερχονται)* D min<sup>3</sup> a b d ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>2</sub> i r *syr sin*  
*diatess Orig<sup>bis</sup> contra rell.*
- ibid.* *εκειθεν (pro απο ιεριχω)* D 2<sup>pe</sup> ?? ‡ a b d f ff<sub>2</sub> i q r goth  
*Orig<sup>bis</sup> contra rell*
- ibid.* *επαιτων* D Sod<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> Orig (et προσαιτων A plur WΣΦ *verss*  
*plur*)  
*προσαιτης* **N**BLΔΨ 892 k W-H & Sod txt [*sed cf. Merx*  
*p. 130]* Om. C\* Paris<sup>97</sup>.
48. *οι πολλοι* Orig (cf sah) No others add *οι* but B\* has *αυτοι*

† Male Tisch de 28. Habet 28 αυτον sed W αυτους. Om. Orig von Soden.

‡ Errat Muralt de 2<sup>pe</sup>? απο ιεριχω habet Belsheim nec aliter Cronin. Vide Sod.

πολλοι for αυτω or αυτον πολλοι. *Sod* does not quote *Orig* or *Clem*.

*Cf Clem<sup>alex</sup> lib* αμελει και των επιβοωμενων του κυριου αυτου οι μεν πολλοι...

- x. 49. αυτον φωνηθηναι *Orig<sup>dis</sup> cum plur et W, contra* **NBCLΔΨ** 7 892 *Sod<sup>tres</sup> et Sod<sup>txt</sup> φωνησατε αυτον cum boh.*

xi. 1/12. See remarks elsewhere (pp. 4/5) about *Origen's* double text here.

- xi. 3. αποστελλει **NBDS<sup>r</sup>** *mult et syr b' c l W-H Sod, sed αποστελει ubique Orig (ter vol iii, et vol iv) cum GUΠ et WΦΨ [non Σ] a d [contra D<sup>sr</sup>] f ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>2</sub> q r δ vg sah boh arm aeth.*

11. -της ωρας **B<sup>sol</sup> cum J<sup>fam</sup> exc 1454** (*Habet Orig rell*)

13. **NB** and *Orig* at variance here also.

14. φαγοι **NB etc.**

- φαγη **DW etc Orig<sup>bis</sup>**

- xii. 1. ανθρωπος τις εφυτευσεν αμπελωνα *Orig et W fam 13 2<sup>pe</sup> Sod<sup>1337</sup> c syr pesh aeth al. pauc.*

αμπελωνα ανθρωπος εφυτευσεν **NBC(L)ΔΦΨ etc.**

(*Cf. rell sub* "Two or more recensions.")

24. *Origen* is specific as to αποκριθεις ειπεν for Mark against εφη of **NBCLΔΨ** 33 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod<sup>1443</sup> & Sod<sup>txt</sup> copt*, that thoroughly representative group, all hanging together for this (as on several previous occasions) an apparent improvement. *Syr pesh* joins this group here, but is opposed by *syr sin* which takes the side of the Latins and other Greeks and *Origen*.

*ibid.* D *Orig* μη γεινωσκοντες pro μη ειδοτες of the rest and W. This seems to be a clear case of retranslation by *Origen*. See p. 159. In Matthew (xxii. 29) ειδοτες is used.

41. εστως *Orig diserte bis (κατα μαρκου) cum W Sod<sup>750</sup> fam 1 fam 13 28 2<sup>pe</sup> Sod<sup>1337</sup> arm syr sin, contra καθισας* **NBD et rell omn et latt copt syr pesh diatess (ex Marco) Hiat goth.**

I would like to point out here that *syr pesh* and *diatess arab* keep with **NB** and the mass against *syr sin* and *Origen*. One should remember this place when praising *syr sin* elsewhere if it supports **NB** and contradicts *syr pesh*. The matter here is of course irreconcilable.

Mr. Sanders does not record this place as to W in his notes on p. 80 owing to his self-imposed limitations (see p. 74).

- xii. 41. κατεναντι *Orig<sup>bis</sup> with N and most, but απεναντι BUΨ 33 71 179 280 348 Sod<sup>quinque</sup> [non Sod<sup>txt</sup>] Paris<sup>97</sup> only.*

43. η χηρα η πτωχη αυτη *Orig<sup>bis</sup> et DΣΦ Sod<sup>750</sup> 7 604 2<sup>pe</sup> Evst<sup>quinque</sup> Sod<sup>751 1216</sup> a b d i q*

- \* (*contra η χηρα αυτη η πτωχη* **NB rell et WΨ**)

αυτη η χηρα η πτωχη 28 *Cf syr, et 21 k (-πτωχη)*

- xiii. 8. +και ταραχαι *Orig<sup>int dis</sup> ("Marcus addit et turbelas") contra* **NBDLΨ Sod<sup>1337</sup> it (praeter q) boh.** This is a square division, with *sah* on *Origen's* side and most Greeks, but practically

Mark

all Latins go with **NBDL** against him. W however comes to his rescue and has it ("εσονται σισμοι κατα τοπους· λιμοι παραχαι") as also **ΣΦ** *Sod*<sup>7050</sup>.

- xiii. 11. *Orig* here goes with W 28 *fam* 13 91 299 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>1337</sup> *k* for *εκεινο*, against *τουτο* of **NB** and most, and *αυτο* of *D*<sup>sr</sup> *c*. Unfortunately *b* is here mutilated. Small as is the place, the fact that *Origen* with W 28 contradicts **NB** *plur* shows a possible foreign base † (with *D*<sup>sr</sup> *c* opposed to *d*) and *b*'s testimony would have been most useful for control. As to 91–299 they are really part of the 1 family, but 1–118–209 apparently have *τουτο*, so that this family is divided amongst itself, but *fam* 13 holds together. Compare this place with xii. 24 above.

12. *Orig* and all *επαναστησονται*, but B *Sod*<sup>3017</sup> *επαναστησεται* (as BΔ 28 *Sod*<sup>1443</sup> at *Matt* x. 21) with *k* *exsurgebit*.

22. *ποιησουσιν* D *Sod*<sup>7050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> *min*<sup>allq</sup> *a d et Orig*<sup>bis</sup> (*ποιησει...ποιει*) *contra NB* *rell* *δωσουσιν*

35. +η (*ante οψε*) **NBCLΔΨ** 892 *Sod*<sup>7050 309</sup> *fam* *φ<sup>a</sup>* *et Sod*<sup>txt</sup> *k?* *sah* *boh aeth* against all the rest and *Origen*.

- ibid.* *μεσονυκτιω* *Origen* with *Hipp?* Σ 238 511 604 *c*<sup>scr</sup> *Sod*<sup>1337</sup> and *latt* *media nocte*, against varying forms in the rest.

- xiv. 10. *ὁ εἰς* (*pro εἰς*) **NBC\*LMΨ** 892 *Sod*<sup>tres et txt</sup> *boh* against *sah* the rest and *Origen* (who was with them just above in dropping *ὁ* before *ισκαριωτης* with *latt*).

- ibid.* Neglect *προσηλθε* here of *Origen* alone for *απηλθεν* of the rest (*ηλθεν* L) as the *προς* following no doubt accounts for *Orig* (*libere*).

- 19 *fin.* *Habet Origen* *και αλλος μητι εγω* *cum* D *unc*<sup>13</sup> **ΣΦ** *minn*<sup>pl</sup> *Sod*<sup>7050</sup> *it*<sup>pl</sup> *contra NBCLPΔWΨ* *copt syr aeth*.

63. +ευθυς W 124 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *a sah arm Orig* (*syr sin*) against the rest.

- xv. 1. *εποιησαν* *Orig* DΔ *Sod*<sup>7050</sup> 245 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>309 1337 1442</sup> *et latt* (*contra* B *plur* *ποιησαντες*, *et NCL* 892 *solī cum Sod*<sup>txt</sup> *ετοιμασαντες*).

- ibid.* *απηγαγον* *Orig* CDGNWΣ [*Hiat Φ*] *al. pauc.* (*latt*) [*contra απηνεγκαν NB plur*].

† See below, xiii. 35 *μεσονυκτιω*.

## CHAPTER IV.

### CONCERNING THE GENESIS OF THE LATIN VERSION OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

"*This (Western) text was translated into Latin before the time of Tatian, and the primitive bilingual in which the translation stood is a document of patriarchal dignity and largely capable of restoration.*"—HARRIS, 'Codex Bezae,' p. 177.

"*But, beyond this, when translations were made into Syriac and Latin (the former certainly, the latter probably, as early as the middle of the second century) the attention of scholars was necessarily directed to the difficulties in interpretation of the text, with its occasional archaic expressions, obscure words, and harsh constructions; and the practical usefulness of a simplified and modernised text was suggested.*"—RAMSAY, 'St. Paul the traveller and the Roman citizen,' p. 25.

To put the matter into as few words as possible, before the new Greek MS W was discovered my studies had already led me to consider that the ancients were probably right when they said that St. Mark had both preached and *written* his Gospel in the Latin tongue [see subscriptions to the Syriac vulgate and to some of our Greek manuscripts]. But this MS W in St. Mark is a perfect mine of wonderful information on this subject.

My impressions to-day are that the Gospel of Mark was written originally in Latin and in Greek, *and circulated separately*—that the Latin went to Latin Africa—thence to Greek Egypt, where it was *translated into Greek*. [But see the quotation further on from St. Jerome in connection with the testimony of Clement of Alexandria.] Hence a double Greek recension visible all along the line. This matter appealed to Blass, for he says ('Philology of the Gospels,' pp. 203 and 205), "To use a simile: reading Mark (with due attention given to the variants) reminds one of walking on quicksand . . . for the difference of readings mainly rests in the expressions and does not affect the sense. But, nevertheless, we feel unsafe and wonder in what way such a condition of the text may have been produced . . . But one of the authors seems to be Luke. Well, and then? Did Luke perhaps interpolate or revise Mark? No, but he translated it, as the original Mark was in Aramaic, or had it translated for his own use, and then revised the translation. At a later time Luke's copy got into circulation and was again copied, and those copies went side by side with copies containing a translation made by somebody else . . ."

Thus Blass. I do not think there is much which points to an Aramaic original. The whole matter can be understood if to St. Peter's Semitic background we apply Mark's Latin surroundings when he wrote, but Blass clearly apprehended the double Greek recension and was striving to account for it.



As to D<sup>sr</sup>, *a* and *d*.

At first it seemed as if *d* were the king, but there are certain independent features in D<sup>sr</sup> which stamp it as of almost equal importance. † For instance in Sir John Hawkins' list of words peculiar to St. Mark's Greek, we find among them (p. 200) *επιραπτω* and *επισυντρεχω*, but in D<sup>sr</sup> for *επιραπτει* (ii. 21) that MS has *επισυνραπτει* and W<sup>sr</sup> *επισυναπτει*. So that this form *επισυν* applies to another word in the Marcan Gospel as well as *επισυντρεχω*. *Επισυνραπτει* stands opposite *adsuit* (the Latins hardly vary here at all) and *adsuit* can scarcely have influenced *επισυνραπτει* or *επισυναπτει*. Excepting *επισυναγω* (Matt., Mark, Luke) no other verb in the New Testament is compounded with *επισυν-*, besides *επισυντρεχω* above mentioned, peculiar to Mark's Greek text at ix. 25. For this the Vulgate and most Latins have *concurrentem*, but *a* = *conlisissit*, while *b d i* = *concurreret*, *f ff<sub>2</sub>* = *concurrit*, *k* = *concurrunt*, *q* = *concurreret*, and *δ* = *concurrerat*. [*ραπτει* 71 only in ii. 21.]

Of course D<sup>sr</sup> of to-day is not the exact original of D<sup>sr</sup> foundation text. We have a splendid illustration of this at xii. 38 in one verse. D<sup>sr</sup> (against *d*) adds *αμα*. This *a* (alone ‡ of Latins) maintains with the addition of *simul*. But two lines below D<sup>sr</sup> goes wild (against *d*'s Latin *et qui volunt*) by writing *και των τελωνων* (for *των θελωντων*). This *a* opposes, having *qui volunt*. The addition of *et* in *d* is due to some curious reaction § which, however, did not conform *d* to D<sup>sr</sup> or D<sup>sr</sup> to *d*, so that we have the opportunity to observe a process at work which is quite interesting. This is followed in the same verse by another illustration which seems helpful. For D<sup>Φ</sup> 2<sup>re</sup> add *ποιεισθαι* at the end of the verse as *d* *facitis*, so that D<sup>sr</sup> *d* hold together. How do the Latins stand? The Greek expression is : *και ασπασμους εν ταις αγοραις* dependent on the original *των θελωντων*. A few cursives only add *φιλοντων* before *ασπασμους* (borrowed from Luke) as do *syr pesh* and *syr sin*, while *sah* repeats *των θελωντων* (אֲרָו עֲרֹרֶעַם) as *arm* and *c* : "qui volunt salutari" but *c* abandons *ασπασμους* (τους ασπασμους *sah boh*) or *salutationes* of *b d e* for *salutari* of *a k i q r δ* [above *ασπασμους*] thus making a composition of *salutationes* and *salutari* and adding *volunt*. Here therefore *b d e* have

† From this Greek the Latin of *a* seems to have been made, quite independently of *d*. For a beautiful although infinitesimal example see vi. 18 *licet te* says *a*, and so D<sup>sr</sup> alone : *εξεστιν σε* right opposite *d* : "*licet tibi*." All other Greeks and Latins use *σοι* and *tibi*. So in other small places, as vi. 35 *ηδη δε* D<sup>sr</sup> 2<sup>re</sup> 604 *a*, but *και ηδη* the Greeks and *d*. See xii. 37 *libentissime* for *libenter* by *a* and D *d* : *και ηδεως*. In the very next verse xii. 38 *a* follows D<sup>sr</sup> alone, against *d*, for *a* has *simul* alone and D<sup>sr</sup> *αμα* alone. At ix. 31 D *d* (as we have them) make bold to remove the apparently pleonastic *αποκτανθεις* (following *αποκτενουσιν*). The only support is from x<sup>ser</sup> y<sup>ser</sup> and *a c k*. All Greek uncials, including W<sup>Ψ</sup> retain, as do *b* and the rest of the Latins. That *a* is found here with D is significant. Here *b* doubtless holds the base and not *d*.

‡ As we pass through the press von Soden teaches us that his new Greek ms 050, sister to D, does not have *αμα*. But he obscures the Latin issue by grouping *a b r i* together, whereas *b r i* do not have *simul* as *a*. Sod<sup>100</sup> has *ποιεισθαι fin*.

§ Add for + *και ante των θελωντων* von Soden's ε 1091 (Sinai 186, Greg. 1223).

the simple *salutationes* dependent on the original *qui volunt*; against *salutari* of *a i k q r δ vg*. We arrive at the conclusion then that *ποιεσθαι* and *facitis* of D<sup>Φ</sup> *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> and *d* is a late accretion to both D and *d*, for *a* rejects it, unless indeed *salutari* of the others is supposed to be a composition of *ασπασμους ποιεσθαι*, but then *salutare* would have been used.

At xiii. 14 D adds *τι αναγεινωσκει* after *ο αναγεινωσκων νοειτω*. *a* also adds *quidquid legit* and *n quod dicit*, while *d* has *quod legit*, so that although D *d* here are together, D<sup>sr</sup> here probably reacted on *d* latin, as *d* differs from *a n* who probably translated from D's Greek. At xiii. 22 *a* has *facient* with *d* and D *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> *ποιησουσιν* against *δωσουσιν* of other Greeks and Latins. xiii. 33 *a* alone follows D<sup>sr</sup> against *d* and all else omitting *εστιν fin*. (Cf *c* which however turns the phrase.)

I wish to add here a most important matter which I think has never been pointed out before. Where D and *d* differ we can frequently discover, by the help of *a*, which reading is basic and which is not in D or *d*.

Thus at xiv. 1 D *d* and *a ff*<sub>2</sub> and only these omit *και τα αζυμα*. This occurs in connection with one of St. Mark's well-known doublets or pairs. *ην δε το πασχα και τα αζυμα*.† We know from the absence of other D *d* sympathisers like 2<sup>pe</sup> etc ‡ that this must be a correction to remove apparent pleonasm, but how came both D and *d* to excise the words? The answer is that Greek D reacted here on small *d*. We know this because it is the Greek of D and not the Latin of *d* which *a* habitually follows. Further proof offers in the same verse. D<sup>sr</sup> and *a i* omit *εν δολω* but *d* has it. Here therefore D<sup>sr</sup> did not react on *d* latin, although *a*, as usual, follows D's Greek. There are several other places where at first sight *a* would seem to strengthen the small combination D *a d*, but as a matter of fact it is now proven that D simply overflowed back as a (wrong) influence on *d*, and *a* is merely an accessory and a witness that this influence came from D<sup>sr</sup> only.

This is well illustrated again at xiv. 25 where D *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> have *ου μη προσθω πειν* as *a* (differing in latin expression from *d*) *d* and *f* only, for *ου μη πιω* of all others. This Greek of D, found only in *a f* otherwise, must have flowed back on to *d*.

The retranslation of *a* (and *k* and sometimes *i*) is often illustrated. It occurs again immediately after at the opening of xiv. 26. The Greeks maintain *και υμνησαντες*, the Latins and the vulgates "*et hymno dicto*," but exceptionally :

*a* = Et cum hymnos dixissent

*i* = Et cum laudem dixissent

*k* = Et cum heminum dixisset

† Only Ψ *Sod*<sup>1489</sup> vary the order *ην δε τα αζυμα και το πασχα*, while *k r*<sub>2</sub> do not like the doublet and have *pascha azumorum* or *azumorum* as *vg*<sup>R</sup> and (*gat*).

‡ Von Soden's 050 appears also to go against D *d a ff* here.

$r$  = Et cum hymnum . . . . . t

$l$  = Et ymnum dicentes

$\delta$  = Et umnisantes

In the same chapter again at xiv. 32 D  $a$   $d$  alone substitute *αυτοις* (illis) for *τοις μαθηταις αυτου* of all others.

At xiv. 44.  $a$  (and  $c$   $k$   $r$ ) go with D<sup>sr</sup> only *εδωκεν* (*δεδωκεν* Sod<sup>050</sup>) by writing *dedit* for *dederat* of all others and  $d$ .

But at xiv. 47 D  $a$   $d$  together omit *των παρεστηκοτων* showing D<sup>sr</sup> has here influenced  $d$ .

At xiv. 67. where D<sup>sr</sup> alone omits *και* before *συ*, we know it is an error, because  $a$  does not follow.

At xiv. 70. — *τω πετρω* D  $a$   $d$ ,

and 72. — *οτι πριν αλεκτορα φωνησαι δις με απαρηνηση* D  $a$   $d$ , they are seen together.

Further, when, as at xiv. 48, both D and  $d$  omit *ως* and *tanquam* before *επι ληστην*, we must assume this to be a common error in the last copying of the MS, as neither  $a$   $k$  nor any others omit. We thus learn that at the last copying even, an effort was made to bring Latin and Greek into conformity.

And when  $n$  replaces  $a$  (as it does from xv. 22 onwards) we must note that  $n$  does not support D<sup>sr</sup> at xv. 34 *ωνειδισας* with  $c$   $i$   $k$  (?) but has *me dereli[quisti]* against them. Thus probably D<sup>sr</sup> and  $c$   $i$   $k$  are conspiring in an error against the mass, and  $n$  controls the old D<sup>sr</sup> as  $a$  did before.

Observe the independence of  $n$  throughout this section, and especially xvi. 4 *amotum* for *revolutum* of the rest of the itala, which although agreeing with the *αποκεκυλισμενον* of D<sup>sr</sup> ( $d$  = *revolutum*) against *αποκεκυλισται* of most, yet appears to hang on a different treatment.

Note also at xvi. 6 where D(W) has *φοβεισθαι* (for *εκθαμβεισθε*) and  $d$  *timere*, that  $n$  follows suit with *timere* against *expavescere* of the others ( $k$  *stupetis*).

As to  $b$ :

The most important Latin witness in St. Mark for "control" is  $b$  [ $k$  is wanting i.–viii.] a feature which Buchanan has quite forgotten to mention in his new and valuable edition of  $b$ .† The text of  $b$  (far removed from  $\mathfrak{f}$  in this Gospel) is a most ancient one. All the O.L. join

† Observe in Mark iii. 32 (where *εκαθητο* bothered  $a$   $e$  so much that they deliberately alter the sentence, although no others know any different verb) that  $\aleph$  alone of Greeks has *προς αυτον οχλος* (for *περι αυτον οχλος*). We look to  $d$  and find *circa eum turba* as the rest of Latins. We look to D and find *προς τον οχλο* and do not understand it. But  $b$  says alone of Latins *ad illum turba*, so that  $\aleph$   $b$  are giving us what D means to give, *τον* standing for *αυτον*. See Harris, 'Study of Codex Bezae,' page 20, where he shows *λον* for *λογον* twice and *λεις* for *λεγεις*. Add *λεις* for *λεγεις* John xiv. 9 and *frum* for *fructum* in  $d$  at John xv. 2. We find even *πε* for *περι* (Mc. v. 27). (Cf. xiv. 58 *τον ναον* (—*τουτον*) D<sup>sr</sup> alone against *hunc templum* by  $d$  opposite.)

D *d* so largely in Mark as a unit (with the exception of *a*) that it has a very deep significance. But *b* goes farther than this and invites inspection as to the fundamental *d* text sometimes preserved in *b* where *d* has lost it. As to *a* the condition is quite different as sketched above. It would seem as if *a* had been independently translated into Latin from a Greek which had already been made from the original Latin.

Long and long ago critics found certain Latin words graecised especially the property of St. Mark, as *σπεκουλατωρ, κεντυριων, ξεστης*,† but explained them away. Sir John Hawkins calls attention (p. 132) to v. 23 *εσχατως εχει*, saying in a note "This expression is condemned by Phrynicius, see Thayer's Lexicon," but if retranslation from the Latin "in extremis est" it could not very well be rendered *εσχατως εστιν*. As to *θυγατριον* mentioned just above this, *filiola* is found in *e*. Now the problem is both simplified and complicated by some of the extraordinary agreements of W<sup>sr</sup> with *e* latin. How it will all work out I cannot say at present.

It is quite unnecessary to repeat that St. Mark probably wrote his Gospel at Rome for Roman readers, and it is beside the mark to say that Greek was the current or polite language of the city or that the names of the early leaders and Popes were Greek names. The oral Gospel appealed first as thoroughly to the oppressed servants and slaves of the Roman households as to their masters; and what was the language of the common people? Of the converted butchers, bakers and purveyors to these households? Of the masons, blacksmiths, carpenters *etc*? Of the Christian attachés and employés of the baths and places of public entertainment? The catacombs tell us, and the inscriptions speak in no uncertain voice that the Latin and Greek tongues were in a state of flux in St. Mark's day. We find Greek words transliterated to Latin, and conversely Latin words expressed in Greek letters. We find *φηλικισσμος* for *felicissimus*, *βιξ* for *bixit* or *vixit*, *φιλιο* for *filio*; or *κοσμου* for *κοσμον*, *ιταιρα* for *εταυρα*, *Θεος* for *Θεος* and so forth. In fact some could speak Greek but only knew the Latin alphabet, others, while knowing enough Latin to speak it, could only write the Greek letters.‡ Hence a Latin,

---

† Cf also Mk. vi. 8 *μη εις την ζωνην χαλκον* ("neque in zonā aes") as against St. Luke (ix. 3 "*μητε αργυριον*"). Cf also Mk. xii. 42 *λεπτα δυο ο εστιν κοδραντης* ("duo minuta quod est quadrans," the lowest Roman coin) as against St. Luke (xxi. 2 "*δυο λεπτα tantum, praeter D + ο εστιν κοδραντης*").

‡ We find the very hybrid graeco-latin words *bisomus*, *trisomus* and *quadrisomus* in common use in the catacombs (to the exclusion of other expressions) for burial space for two bodies, three bodies, and four bodies.

Sometimes Δ occurs for D throughout a Latin inscription (see No. 142 in Marucchi and others).

We come across such a thing as this:

KALEMERE DEVS REFRI  
GERET SPIRITVM TVVM  
VNA CVM SoRoRiS TVAE HILARAE.

Or *benemerenti*, *et*, and *φειλιε* in the middle of a Greek inscription, and observe the Greek rho in *benemerenti*.

or a Graeco-Latin written Gospel seems *a priori* to have been perfectly natural and called for under the circumstances; and not necessarily a bilingual, but two separate editions, one in Greek and one in Latin. The Latin original, if represented by *b* and *d*, seems to have parted company with the Greek original very soon if not immediately. It reappears in *a* and part of *k* to some extent, but *a* is a fresh translation from the Greek as *k* seems to be in many places.† The consensus of Latins with *b d*

ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟ ΕΤ ΛΕΟΝΤΙΑ  
 ΟΕΙΡΙΚΕ ΦΕΙΛΙΕ ΒΕΝΕΜΕΡΕΝ  
 ΤΙ ΜΝΗCΘΗC ΙΗCΟΥC  
 Ο ΚΥΡΙΟC ΤΕΚΝΟΝ.

We find *septem* (ΣΕΠΤΕ *sic*) with ANN in the middle, at the end of a Greek inscription:

ΕΡΜΑΙΚΕ ΦΩC Ζ  
 ΗC ΕΝ ΘΕΩ ΚΥΡΙΕΙ  
 Ω ΧΡΕΙCΤΩ ANN  
 ΩΡΟΥΜ Χ ΜΗCΩ  
 ΡΟΥΜ ΣΕΠΤΕ.

In the middle of a Greek inscription (Marucchi No. 344) occurs BONIΦΑΤΙΕ.

From the catacombs of Domitilla, observe two Latin lines followed by Greek in Latin letters:

ANNIBONVS FECIT SIBI ET SVIS  
 LOCVM HOMIBVS N VIII INTRO FORMAS  
 ΕC ΤΟΝ ΕΜΟΝ ΠΑΝΤΟΝ ΤΥΤΟ ΕΜΟΝ.

This lasted a long while. There is a Latin inscr. in Greek letters throughout, dated 269 A.D.

ΚΩCΟΥΛΕ ΚΛΥΔΙΩ ΕΔ ΠΑΤΕΡΝΩ ΝΟΝΕΙC  
 ΝΟΒΕΝΒΡΕΙΒΟΥC ΔΕΙ Ε ΒΕΝΕΡΕC ΛΟΥΝΑ ΧΧΙΙΙ  
 ΛΕΥΚΕ ΦΙΛΙΕ CΗΒΗΡΕ ΚΑΡΕCCEΜΕ ΡΟCΟΥΕΤΕ  
 ΕΔ ΕΙCΠΕΙΡΙΤΩ CΑΝΚΤΩ ΤΟΥΩ.

On the shorter and earlier inscriptions such Latin names as *Flavus* or *Flavius*, *Septimius* etc are written in Greek characters:

For instance: ΦΛ · CΑΒΕΙΝΟC · ΚΑΙ  
 ΤΙΤΙΑΝΗ · ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ

And again: CΕΠΤΜΙΟC ΠΡΑΙΤΕΞΤΑΤΟC  
 ΚΑΙ ΚΙΛΙΑΝΟC

Or ANNIA ΦΑΥCΤΕΙΝΑ

Or ANNIOC ΚΑΤΟC

Or ΑΙΚΙΝΙΑ ΦΑΥCΤΕΙΝΑ

† A good example occurs at xiv. 54 where the 23 uncials and W write *ην συν* (or *συγ*) *καθήμενος* but D *it vg ην καθήμενος*. Tischendorf observes "*it<sup>vi</sup> vg erat sedens, sedens, sedebat; k accurate fuit simul sedens,*" but he should have said...*k ex graeco fuit simul sedens.*" The Latins all hang together against any *consedens* or *simul sedens* except *k*, which as we thus see is bringing his Latin into conformity with the Greek, while D<sup>sc</sup> alone follows the Latin.

shows that the Latin as an entity remained knit together. With the Greek it is quite different. D reappears in Egypt in W but with modifications incident to a passage of *d* through Carthage previously, where it had become modified to *c* and *e*. The Greek of NB is quite different again from that of DW, although N shows occasional traces of W *e*, and B of W or D. Did the Greek of D perish by shipwreck or otherwise on its way to Alexandria?† Or did they use at first only St. Matthew and St. Luke in those parts? The early Fathers are strangely silent as to quotations from St. Mark.

Among one of the first distinct quotations from St. Mark (v. 34) it is noticeable that *Clem*<sup>Alex</sup> gives us ἀπελθε εἰς εἰρηνὴν for υπαγε εἰς εἰρηνὴν. [Luke says πορευου.] The Latin is *vade*. See later for remarks as to Clement in connection with what St. Jerome says of Mark's personal arrival at Alexandria, bringing his Gospel with him.

#### *As to c :*

*c* is also a valuable adjunct for control as to the original base *b c d e*. Its glosses are reproduced by W<sup>sr</sup>, and it has many Egyptian characteristics. Whether it ever had an accompanying Greek column we do not know, but the corruption *per labia* for *per manus* in vi. 2 probably arose from confounding χειλεων or χειλων with χειρων. One thing is very certain, *aeth* and *c* are very close in Mark. Among other places observe Mark vi. 38 — και γνωντες *c aeth* and *syr sin*. The latter adds force to the basic age of the recension.

Then, as shown beyond, *Tertullian* and *aeth* share the otherwise unique reading in xiv. 13 *invenietis hominem* for *occurrent vobis homo*.

Besides this *c* and *Tert* are in apposition in other Gospels.

A curious coincidence occurs at Mark ii. 26, where for εισηλθεν, W alone substitutes εισελθων, not supported by our Latin witnesses, but by Jerome with *ingressus* (*Ep ad Pamm*: "Idem Marcus inducit ad Pharisaeos salvatorem loquentem 'Nunquam legistis . . . quomodo ingressus domum Dei sub Abiathar . . .'").

#### *St. Mark in the Irish Latin texts.*

One striking fact deserves notice, and that is that when the Irish text of the four Gospels was copied St. Mark's Gospel alone appears in almost pure Vulgate dress. Why was this? It must be concerned with

---

† Observe v. 37 παρακολουθησαι DW *fam* 1 28 124 2<sup>re</sup> 604, ακολουθησαι AKΠ\* *al*<sup>3</sup>, συνακολουθησαι NB *rell*. While the Latins use *sequi*, W elides μετ αυτου, and *e* has *introire* with *Sod*<sup>300</sup> εισελθειν. But the point is that παρακολουθησαι bears directly on the wording of the end of Mark, for at xvi. 17 παρακολουθησει occurs, and this has been challenged as not being a Marcan compound or occurring elsewhere in the Gospel, whereas DW confirm it in Mark v. 37, at any rate as to *their* Greek.

the irreconcilable differences observed between the *two* separate Greek lines or recensions to which I wish to direct attention. Not being able to decide to follow the *itala*, so largely interwoven with the *b d* base, which disagreed with the Greek line of **NB**, except in spots, it was evidently considered judicious to swallow St. Jerome's revision almost completely for St. Mark. That there was a reason for it is obvious. Have we found the true reason in assuming a double Greek recension? This must be further investigated, but I see no other outlet.

*Base of St. Mark's Gospel.*

So much has been written concerning St. Mark's Gospel that it may be thought that the subject is threadbare. This hardly seems to be the case, but I would fain bring forward something new if possible. What I suggest has already found circuitous admission by other minds. For instance, in Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*, p. 207, after referring to the proportion of classical and non-classical words in the four Gospels, he says :

*"It thus appears that the non-classical words (like the non-Septuagintal words) occur with considerable more frequency in the special vocabulary of St. Mark than in those of the other synoptists."*

In other places he agrees with most authorities in giving priority to the Marcan Gospel as regards its *foundation*, where roughnesses, not of diction but of the manner of presenting facts, have been smoothed by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

Taking these two observations together, they make for a *later* Greek than that of Matthew and Luke, with an *earlier* base. Now if that base be Latin the matter is to a large extent explained. Little things like *εσχαραν* (Mark) for *υστερον* (Matt. Luke) then assume a greater force than we have been disposed to give them.

Sir John emphasises the historic present as being one of Mark's strong preferences. Indeed, this also bears upon the point. For the *aits* of *d* often bear opposite in D<sup>gr</sup> *ειπεν*, while the *itala* coincides with the *ait* of *d*. † Further than this, where the strong Alexandrian preferences for the historic present and imperfect over the aorist make themselves felt

† This matter deserves considerable attention. Compare Dr. Nestle's too brief notice of the subject in *Journ. Theol. Studies*, July 1911, p. 607, and consider the figures given for *b* and *d* in St. Mark in connection with such a Roman writer as Plautus, whose plays are crammed full of *ait* and *ais* and *aio*. Cf. *Amphitruo* I. i. 188-189.

*Merc.* Ai' n' vero?

*Sos.* Aio enimvero.

*Merc.* Verbero!

*Sos.* Mentiris nunc jam.

*Merc.* At jam faciam ut verum dicas dicere.

*Sos.* Quid eo 'st opus?

Notice also the frequent appearance in Mark of *ερχεται* (for the indeterminate Latin *venit*, present or perfect) against the synoptic *ηλθεν*.

in **NB** in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, it is different in St. Mark, and although I chronicle a fair number of these additional Greek historic presents for **N** or **B** in St. Mark, the situation is more confused there and sometimes the aorist is preferred to the imperfect.

Before we can deal with the list of "Rude, harsh, obscure or unusual words or expressions which may therefore have been omitted or replaced by others" (*op. cit.* pp. 131/4) we must consider more fully what the Latin texts have to say, and variations in Greek MSS. Thus, as to the first example,

i. 10 *σχιζομενους*, did St. Mark himself really use this? The Latins *b d f ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>1</sub> g<sub>2</sub> h l r r<sub>2</sub> δ* (*hiant i q*) all say *apertos* (even *a adaperiri, c aperiri*). So *D<sup>sr</sup> sol.*

Then, ii. 4 *etc κραβατος*. This surely belongs among the Latinisms, cited lower down.

As to ii. 21 *επιραπτει*, we must observe *D's επισυναπτει* and *W's επισυναπτι* as to retranslation, or as to two lines of Greek.

xi. 1. *εισω τινες ωδε των εστηκοτων*, "an awkward arrangement of words" says Sir John Hawkins, but the MSS vary here considerably. (See *ante* p. 100.)

xiii. 11. *μη προμεριμνατε*, "a verb not found elsewhere in N.T., LXX, or classical writers." But if *cogitare* were original we can understand it. (*a* here retranslating, as usual, has *prae-medetare* (*cf. προμελετατε Ψ<sub>2</sub>*), *k* exceptionally *satagare* but both *a* and *k* have been influenced by Greek recensions as compared to the other Latins in St. Mark).

16. *ο εις τον αγρον*, a very probable Latin construction.

xiv. 31. *εκπερισσως* † "is found nowhere else in Greek."

Perhaps from a Latin colloquialism "*tanto magis*" as indeed re-rendered by *a* (while *k* has "*plura loquebatur magis dicere*" against *amplius* of most *vett.*).

xiii. 19. *εσονται γαρ αι ημεραι εκειναι θλιψις* (or *θλιψεις*). This is far more difficult, in fact insoluble from our available Latin materials, which do not agree with the Greeks, who here seem to be a unit, yet an original *dies illi tribulationes*, meant for *dies illi tribulationis* which *c ff<sub>2</sub> i l* hold, might have led to the Greek, which is opposed by *a b d k n q r* "(in) *illis diebus tribulationes*" and which in these may not represent an original base but revision.

Unfortunately, for such Greek words—unique in Mark—as *σκοληξ, στασιαστης* we have no synoptic parallelisms to use for purposes of exact comparison. *στασιαστης* of Mark xv. 7 (*μετα των στασιαστων δεδεμενος*) is however beautifully confirmed by St. Luke's *δια στασω* (xxiii. 19).

† It is exceedingly curious to find that the notorious latinisers 56–58–61, apparently alone among cursives, join **NBCDΨ<sup>7</sup>12** for *εκπερισσως*. Add Paris<sup>97</sup>.



σανδاليا Mark vi. 9 (not appearing in Sir John Hawkins' list of words peculiar to St. Mark, probably because it occurs in Acts xii. 8) may be emphasised as compared to the υποδηματα of Matt. x. 10.

In Mark *d i* have *sandalia*, *b f l q* = *sandaliis*, so that probably *soleis* of *a*, *soleas* of *e*, *caligulas* of *c*, *galliculas* of *ff<sub>2</sub>* are retranslations.

υποληνιον Mark xii. 1, unique as to Mark and as against ληνον of Matt. xxi. 33, is indeterminate.

In Mark *b c d f g<sub>2</sub> l* (*q* locum) *δ vg* have *lacum* (*a ff<sub>2</sub> i k* torcular).

In Matthew *a b c d* (*e* torcularem) *ff<sub>2</sub> g l q vg* have torcular (*ff<sub>1</sub> h* lacum).

*Lacum* would appear original in Mark, and *torcular* in Matthew. But it is almost impossible to draw any inferences, although υποληνιον may be considered more probable for *lacus*.

*Important example of harmony among the Latins at St. Mark vi. 36.*

One of the most striking places is the εγγιστα of D 604 and *all latt* PROXIMAS at vi. 36 against κυκλω of the other Greeks. Not a single Latin tries to express κυκλω otherwise here in Mark.† But now turn to the parallel in Luke ix. 12 and see a very different state of things. The Greek of both passages is the same:

Mark vi. 36. απολυσον αυτους ινα απελθοντες εις τους κυκλω αγρους και  
κωμας...

Luke ix. 12. απολυσον τον οχλον ινα πορευθεντες } εις τας κυκλω κωμας και  
απελθοντες } αγρους...

(Matthew omits κυκλω.)

In Mark then the Latins have: *in* PROXIMAS villas et vicos.‡

But in Luke *a* = adjacentes vicos et agros

*b e ff<sub>2</sub> l q r* = circa castella et villas

*μ* = circa castella et vicos

*c* = in castella adjacentia

*d* = in proxima castella et villas

*δ* = in circum castella et villas

*f* = in castella et villas quae in circuitu sunt

*vg* = in castella villasque quae circa sunt

I submit that this has a distinct bearing on a common *Latin* base in Mark of *proximas*, and a common *Greek* base in Luke of κυκλω, when we see in Luke the variations *circa*, *adjacentes*, *adjacentia*, *proxima*, *in*

† Cf. also xi. 32 ηδεισαν (*pro* ειχον) DW Sod<sup>(5)</sup> 2<sup>re</sup> and οιδουσι 604 = sciebant of *it<sup>n</sup>* against habebant of all vulgates. The *proof* of retranslation is here afforded by 604.

‡ All have *in proximas*. *a* = in proximas villas et municipia

*b c f ff<sub>2</sub> q* = in proximas villas et castella

*d i l* = in proximas villas et (+ in *i*) vicos

*r<sub>2</sub>* = in proximas villas et vicinos

(*hiant e k q*) Δ δ = { <sup>in vicos</sup> ΕΙΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΚΥΚΛΩ ΑΓΡΟΥΣ } *sic*

*circum, quae circa sunt, and quae in circuitu sunt, against the steady proximas in Mark.*

For the rest I must refer to the following lists.

*And first as to Retranslation in W.*

The following is a list of some of the apparent retranslations in W. It is startling enough, but there is much more to be observed.

Mark

- i. 27. θαυμαζον (pro εθαμβηθησαν)
- 44. καθαρσιου (pro καθαρισμου)
- ii. 4. προσελθειν (pro προσεγγισαι)
- 12. θαυμαζειν αυτους (pro εξιστασθαι παντας)
- 23. εσπαρμενων (pro σποριμων)
- iii. 11. ιδον (pro εθεωρει) [Negl. Sod. W. Male Sod. de D ειδον, habet εθεωρουν]
- 30. εχειν αυτον (pro εχει)
- 34. κυκλω αυτου (pro κυκλω τους περι αυτον)
- iv. 4. τα ορνεα (pro τα πετεινα)
- 20. πιπτοντες (pro σπαρεντες)
- 32. αυξει (pro αναβαινει)
- v. 31. συντριβοντα (pro συνθλιβοντα)
- vi. 5. ουκετι (pro εκει ουδεμιαν)
- 13. εξεπεμπον (pro εξεβαλλον)
- 31. λοιπον (pro ολιγον)
- vii. 10. αθετων (pro κακολογων)
- 19. διανοιαν (pro καρδιαν)
- 31. εις την δεκαπολιν (pro δεκαπολεως)
- 33. προσλαβομενος (pro απολαβομενος)
- viii. 11. απ (pro παρ)
- 23. ενπτυσας (pro πτυσας)
- ix. 8. περιβλεπομενοι (pro περιβλεψαμενοι)
- 11. τι ουν (pro οτι pr<sup>iti</sup>)
- 32. ερωτησαι (pro επερωτησαι) (a<sup>l</sup><sup>allq</sup>)
- 45. κοψον (pro αποκοψον)
- 49. αλισ γηθησεται (pro αλισθησεται)
- x. 22. απο του λογου (pro επι τω λογω)
- 35. αιτησωμεθα (pro αιτησωμεν)
- xi. 12. αυριον (pro επαυριον)
- 25. αυη (pro αφη) [Negl. Sod]
- 30. απ (pro εξ pr.) (a<sup>l</sup><sup>allq</sup>)
- xii. 1. εξωρυξεν (pro και ωρυξεν)
- 3. εδιραν + και απεκτιναν (346)
- 10, 26. ανεγνωκατε (pro ανεγνωτε)
- xiii. 2. αφεθη ουδε διαλυθησεται (pro καταλυθη)
- 12. αναστησονται (pro επαναστησονται) (348 Sod<sup>1043</sup>)
- xiv. 6. κοπον (pro κοπους)

xiv. 27. σκορπισθησεται (pro διασκορπισθησεται) [Negl. Sod]

32. *ἐξέρχονται* (*pro* *έρχονται*)

53. *συνπορευονται* (*pro* *συνερχονται* *αυτω*) (*Sod*<sup>1337</sup>)

61. *ευλογημενου* (*pro* *ευλογητου*) and so  $\Psi$  28 c<sup>scr</sup>

70. περιεστηκοτες (πρὸ παρεστωτες) (cf. a)

xvi. 1. εἰσελθουσαι (πρὸ ελθουσαι)

5. θεωρουσιν (pro ειδον)

Observe also in iii. 1 a genitive absolute *καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ* for *καὶ εἰσηλθὲν*, which cannot come from the parallels, and must be from *b c e* "et cum introisset." The others have "et introivit." Cf ix. 28, where for "et cum introisset" of all Latins the Greeks only vary between *εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ* and *εἰσελθόντα αὐτοῦ*.

Consider also *γίνεται* and *εγείετο*:

At iv. 37 D writes *eyeveeto* with which *Tisch* groups all the Latins, while *γυβεται* (so W) is the reading of the other Greeks. But observe the reverse at :

ii. 15. *γίνεται* only NBLW 33 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 892\* *W-H* & *Sod txt*, and *εγγενητο* D and all the rest. [*Om. Sod*<sup>7050</sup>.]

It seems clear that *factus est* or *facta est* or *factum est* is rendered either *γινεται* or *εγενετο*. And the way in which the mss occasionally go apart looks like a Latin base out of which the variations sprung.

When I published *Evan 604* it became apparent that there was a reason for the Latinisms in that MS, when we took into consideration the sympathetic bond between D 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604. It became clear to me how ancient was this Latin base. Lest some should still think that the Latinisms and evidences of retranslation in 1 13 28 2<sup>pe</sup> and 604 are late, I have exhibited first a typical list in the great MS W.

Now there is much *less* of this in 28 and not more as we come down the line, as far as actual age (not actual text) is concerned. But to show how the matter is interlocked I will exhibit these examples.

We find in 28 at:

i. 19. κατασκευαζοντας (*pro* καταρτιζοντας), but this is visible in 124  
[*non fam*] although not in W.

xii. 34. *συναιτως* (= *συνετως*) *pro* *νουνεχως* apparently unique by 28.

xiv. 1. κρατησωσιν και (pro κρατησαντες) = *latt syrr* (et *Sod minn*<sup>5</sup>).

As to 28 and 604 :

iii. 14. Here 28 and 604 conspire alone to give us *περι αυτου (pro μετ αυτου)*

As to 604 alone :

Mark

- i. 18. *λιαν* (*pro* *δικτυα*)
- iv. 41. *ελαλουν* (*pro* *ελεγον*)
- v. 1. *λιμνης* (*pro* *θαλασσης*) (*Cf.* *Merx de λιμν. et θαλ.*)
- ix. 10. *ετηρησαν* (*pro* *εκρατησαν*) [*Cf.* D vii. 4 *τηρειν* alone for *κρατειν*]
- xi. 32. *οιδασι* (*pro* *ηδεισαν* DW ; *sciebant latt*)

2<sup>pe</sup> alone :

- vi. 50. *αυτοις* (*pro* *μετ αυτων*), where D 33 604 Paris<sup>97</sup> have *προς αυτους*  
*Om. Sod<sup>fam</sup> φ<sup>a</sup>. Om. μετ αυτων και λεγει 273.*

2<sup>pe</sup> and 604 :

- vi. 37. *ινα φαγωσιν* (*pro* *φαγειν sec.*) *Cf. a b q. Cf. syr sin.*
- x. 16. *επιθεις* (*pro* *τιθεις*)
- xiii. 8. *αναστησεται* (*pro* *εγερθησεται*) [*Sod* adds <sup>050</sup>]
- xiv. 29. *καν* (*pro* *και ει*) Add *Sod<sup>050 8371</sup>* and D (*και εαν*)

D 28 :

- xiii. 17. *θηλαζομεναις* (*pro* *θηλαζουσαις*)

D 2<sup>pe</sup> :

- vi. 47. *εν μεση τη θαλασση* (*pro* *εν μ. της θαλασσης*)
- viii. 17. *εστιν η καρδια* (*pro* *εχετε την καρδιαν*) Add *Sod<sup>050</sup>*
- xiv. 55. *ινα θανατωσουσιν* (*pro* *εις το θανατωσαι*) *et* J *Sod<sup>050</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup>*

D 604 :

- vi. 36. *εγγιστα* (*pro* *κυκλω*) *latt<sup>omn</sup> proximas*

D 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 :

- vi. 48. *και ελαυνοντας* (*pro* *εν τω ελαυνειν*) [*Sod* adds <sup>050</sup> ?]
- 56. *πλατειαις* (*pro* *αγοραις*)

W 604 :

- ix. 18. *ηδυνηθησαν* (*pro* *ισχυσαν*) Add *Sod<sup>1093</sup>*

W 28 :

- vi. 29. *κηδευσαι* (*pro* *και ηραν*)
- ix. 31. *εγειρεται* (*pro* *αναστησεται*) Add *Sod<sup>1337</sup>*
- 33. *διελεχθητε* (*pro* *διελογιζεσθε*) Add *fam 1* and *Sod<sup>1337</sup>*
- xiii. 27. *επισυνστρεφουσιν* *sic et W et 28* (*pro* *επισυναξει vel επισυναξουσι*)  
[*Male Sod de W*]
- xv. 41. *διηκονουσαν* (*pro* *και διηκονουν*) W ; *διακονουσαι 28* [*Recte Sod. Male Scholz διακονησαι*]

W 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 :

- v. 22. *ω ονομα* (*pro* *ονοματι*) [*Negl. Sod 604*]

D(W) :

- ix. 3. *ως* (*pro* *οια*) *Cf. W*
- 37. *εν τω ονοματι* (*pro* *επι τω ον.*) Add 69 *Sod<sup>3015</sup>* in nomine *latt*
- 42. *εβληθη* (*pro* *βεβληται*)

DW 2<sup>pe</sup> :

- xvi. 6. *φοβεισθαι* (*pro* *εκθαμβεισθε*) Add 115

and such a thing as in **N**:

**NW** *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 1 13 28 2<sup>re</sup> 604:

xii. 41. + τον (*ante χαλκον*) [*Add Sod*<sup>1337</sup>. *Negl. Sod N ut Tisch om. ed*<sup>viii</sup>]

or in **C**:

vi. 19. ἐζητει (*pro ηθελεν*) **C** *latt*

or in **Δ**\*:

xiii. 8. αντι εθνον (*pro επ εθνος*) **Δ**\*; so *contra gentem b c d δ\** *vg*<sup>allq</sup>, *adversus gentem q*. [*Sod neglects Δ*\*: *Δ*\*<sup>ipse</sup> has επ εθνος *supra* but as an afterthought.]

or *Origen*:

xii. 24. γνωσκοντες (*pro ειδοτες*) **D** *Orig* alone (*cf. latt vett*<sup>pl</sup>)

not to speak of **N**, which has a good many personal retranslations, but they are involved frequently with parallels.†

At any rate the matters in question are all easily reducible to a very early age.

As to a thing like xii. 18 *αναστασις ουκ εστιν fam* 1 13 28 [*non DW rell*] for *αναστασις μη ειναι* this is probable retranslation, but has no reference to other features.

We will now allow to follow a list of some of the evidence for a double or treble Greek recension in St. Mark as opposed to what comes very near a single line among the Latins.

If ever Bishop Westcott's dictum‡ holds true it is as regards the authorities for St. Mark's Gospel. It is useless to seek the truth in any one document here, and although **D d** have an ancient base, **b** is found to share it and go beyond them in brevity, while **W** in connection with **b e k** and the other Latins is absolutely essential to a true understanding of the mixture (old as it all is) which pervades the text. **NB** alone here are more than useless.

† It does not seem necessary to tabulate the many unique retranslations of **D**<sup>sc</sup> from Latin, as they are so well known, although I know of no complete list.

‡ "No authority has an unvarying value. No authority is ever homogeneous." Compare also Blass ('Philology of the Gospels,' pp. 58 and 70): "In reality the blame is to be cast upon the textual tradition and not upon the author, and we may learn from this quite evident case that those written copies (not to speak of editions) which we are accustomed to rely upon by no means deserve implicit trust. Which copies, then, do deserve it? No single copy at all, but if anything the tradition taken as a whole, with entire liberty to select in each individual case that branch of the tradition for our guide which shall seem to us to be in this case most trustworthy, even if it is a heretical witness like Marcion."

"Of course, the fact that *πρώτη* in one of these passages, and *Λιβερίων* in the other, is almost universally attested, is not to be understood as being the result of one great deliberate action, viz., of a revision of the text made at a definite time by definite men, and then imposed upon the whole Christian Church. If such a revision had taken place in the ancient Church, like those revisions which have been made for instance at different times in the English Church, we should certainly hear of that fact from some of the numerous ecclesiastical writers whose works have come down to us."

## CHAPTER V.

### TWO OR MORE GREEK RECENSIONS IN ST. MARK.

"We have now shown reasons for believing that the whole body of Western Latin readings go back into a single bilingual copy, the remote ancestor of the Codex Bezae; and we have also seen that the Greek of the Beza owes the greater part of its textual and grammatical peculiarities to the reflex action of *its own Latin*."—Rendel Harris, 'Codex Bezae,' p. 171.

"There are cases where a book or paper, whose actual results cannot be accepted, is far more valuable and suggestive than many statements of certain and indisputable facts are. Hicks' paper is one of these cases; its value in method is quite distinct from its value in results."—Ramsay, 'St. Paul at Ephesus' in 'The Church in the Roman Empire,' p. 118.

The very imperfect suggestions offered in my 'Genesis of the Versions,' vol. I. p. 28 *seq.*, are much more fully illustrated here. Any examples which seem beside the mark are amply compensated for by others which show a definite Latin background.

Mark

- |         |  |                                     |   |                        |
|---------|--|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| fi.     | 6. <i>δερην</i>  | D <sup>sr</sup> pellem a            | (Cf. p. 127 <i>seq.</i> )                                   | vestem depilis r (syr) |
|         | <i>τριχας</i>  | <i>rell gr et d</i>                 |   |                        |
| fi.     | 7. <i>και ελεγεν αυτοις</i>                              | D d a (r)                           |   |                        |
|         | <i>και εκηρυσσεν λεγων</i>                               | <i>rell</i>                         |   |                        |
| 16.     | <i>τον αδελφον αυτου</i>                                 | DGΓ et W                            | 28 33 372 al. it <sup>pl</sup> vg syr aeth                  |                        |
|         | " " "  | <i>του σιμωνος</i>                  | E*FHKSUVP et ΣΦ al.   | <i>mult goth slav</i>  |
|         | " " <i>του σιμωνος</i>                                   | AE <sup>2</sup> Δ min <sup>20</sup> |   |                        |
|         | " " <i>σιμωνος</i>                                       | NBLM z <sup>scr</sup> al.           |   | } a r δ copt arm       |
| 24.     | <i>οιδαμεν</i>   | NLΔ <sup>sr</sup> 892 boh           | (hiat sah) arm aeth Orig <sup>bls</sup> Orig <sup>int</sup> |                        |
|         | <i>οιδα</i>  | BD <i>rell et W</i>                 | ΣΦ minn omn <i>rell vid, latt omn et δ</i>                  |                        |
|         |  |                                     | [contra Δ <sup>sr</sup> ] syr pers goth W-H <sup>txt</sup>  |                        |
| 31.     | <i>εκτεινας την χειρα κρατησας ηγειρεν αυτην</i>         | D b d r q                           | (- αυτην)   | (f + αυτην)            |
|         | <i>ηγειρεν αυτην κρατησας της χειρος</i>                 | <i>rell et al. lat</i>              | (tenens e)  |                        |
|         | <i>εκτεινας την χειρα και επιλαβομενος εγειρεν αυτην</i> | W                                   |   |                        |
| ii. 15. | <i>γινεται</i>   | NBLW 33 2 <sup>pe</sup> 604 892*    |   |                        |
|         | <i>εγενετο</i>   | D <i>rell (Om. Sod)</i>             | 750   | } factum est latt      |
| 23.     | <i>διαπορευεσθαι</i>                                     | BCD                                 |   |                        |
|         | <i>πορευεσθαι</i>  | W fam 13 Sod                        | 1444  | } Cf latt              |
|         | <i>παρπορευεσθαι</i>                                     | N plur                              |   |                        |
| 26.     | <i>μετ αυτου</i>   | DWΣ Sod                             | 750 2 <sup>pe</sup> 604 al <sup>11</sup>                    |                        |
|         | <i>συν αυτω</i>  | NB <i>rell et Φ</i>                 |   |                        |

† But such circumscribed divisions I do not add to further.

‡ But *Tert<sup>marc</sup>* "scio" doubtless *ex Luc* iv. 34 and *Tert<sup>prax</sup>* probably refers to Luke iv. 41.

Mark

- iii. 3. τω την ξηραν χειρα εχοντι **NC\*Δ** Sod<sup>950</sup> δ Tisch ed<sup>viii</sup> txt  
 τω την χειρα εχοντι ξηραν **B(L)** 2<sup>pe</sup> 892 a boh sah  
 aeth (syr — εχοντι) Treg W-H txt  
 τω ξηραν εχοντι την χειρα 33  
 τω εξηραμμενην εχοντι την χειρα **Unc<sup>10</sup>** al. et **ΣΦ** txt rec. et  
 Tisch vii.  
 τω εχοντι την χειρα εξηραμμενην **D** cf lat  
 τω εχοντι την χειρα ξηραν **W**  
 τω την χειρα εχοντι εξηραμμενην 28 124  
 τω την εξηραμμενην χειρα εχοντι **Sod** txt **ABSQUE ULLA**  
**AUCTORITATE.**
7. εις **DHP** 131 209 238 y<sup>scr</sup> z<sup>scr</sup>  
 al<sup>20</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> }  
 επι **Σ** al. ? [non apud Sod] }  
 προς **NB** plur et **WΦ** 1 al. mult } Lat: ad  
 εις }  
 προς } sic 118  
 παρα } fam 13 28 Sod<sup>1216</sup> }
8. ακουοντες **NBΔ** et **W** fam 1 fam 13  
 892 2<sup>pe</sup> copt W-H Sod<sup>txt</sup> } audientes latt<sup>pl</sup>  
 ακουσαντες **D<sup>sr</sup>** rell pl a syr arm }
31. σταντες **N** (cf lat stantes)  
 στηκοντες **BC\*Δ** 28  
 εστηκοτες **C<sup>2</sup>GL** fam 1 124 604 892 Sod<sup>243</sup>  
 εστωτες **DW** rell gr minn et 2<sup>pe</sup>
- ibid. καλουντες **NBCL** et **W** 1 13 28 892 W-H Sod }  
 φωνουντες **D** rell (λαλουντες 2<sup>pe</sup>) } vocantes latt  
 ζητουντες **A**
- Om. Δ δ α
- iv. 8. αυξανομενον **DACLΔ** et **W**  
 238 892 Sod<sup>txt</sup> }  
 αυξανοντα **Π** unc<sup>9</sup> et **ΣΦ** } crescentem c d ff<sub>2</sub> i l q r δ  
 28 minn txt rec. } vg et increscentem b  
 (mut e k)  
 cum incremento a (om 2<sup>pe</sup>)
- sed αυξανομενα **NB** soli et W-H R-V (De ἄλλα in it??)
10. οι μαθηται αυτου **DW** Sod<sup>950</sup> fam 13 28 2<sup>pe</sup> it omn (non f) syr<sup>sin</sup>  
 οι περι αυτου συν τοις δωδεκα **NB** rell omn syr pesh vg copt aeth
- ibid. τις η παραβολη αυτη **DW** Sod<sup>950</sup> fam 13 28 2<sup>pe</sup> it omn et f  
 τας παραβολας **NBCLΔ** 892 et W-H txt (syr sin)  
 την παραβολην **A** unc<sup>10</sup> et **ΣΦ** et Sod txt  
 De parabola illa vel de parabolis illis syr boh (εϷε) et sah  
 των παραβολων
12. αφεθησομαι **D\*** d ff<sub>2</sub> i q r vg<sup>G</sup> aeth (αφησω D<sup>b</sup>)  
 αφεθη **NBLΔ** unc<sup>8</sup> et **WΣΦ** Sod<sup>950</sup> Orig 1/2 }  
 αφεθησεται **AKΠ** min aliq Orig 1/2 } (sah boh syr)

Mark

- iv. 15. ἀφέρει D  
 ερει W 28  
 αρπαζει NCA (Matt.)  
 αιρει B plur  
 (i<sup>pl</sup> vg aufert vel tollit, auferet c d l q)
21. ἐρχεται Plur et syr pesh l q vg Om. Sod<sup>duo</sup>  
 adfertur b } aeth accendit  
 ἀπτεται D (vis duplex) } d (accenditur)  
 καιεται W sah boh it pl } luc. et afferet
31. οποταν W  
 ο οτι αν D  
 οταν N  
 ος οταν B plur  
 ως οταν C\*Δ
32. αυξει W b e r (cf. c q)  
 αναβαινει NB rell pl  
 Om D d i, habent και γινεται tantum
39. φιμωθητι W b c e ff<sub>2</sub>  
 σιωπα και φιμωθητι D<sup>gr</sup> aeth sah boh vg<sup>AFLT</sup>  
 σιωπα πεφιμωσο NB rell, d et latt rell syr (hiat sin)  
 σιωπα φιμωσο L [Om. claus. Δ δ]
- v. 3. μνημασιν NABCLΔΠ unc<sup>8</sup> Sod<sup>05</sup> } Cf xv. 46 et  
 μνημειοις DH al. et W } xvi. 2.
6. προσεδραμεν W d b c e i q, r (occurrit)  
 εδραμεν NB rell et D<sup>gr</sup>
19. απαγγελον NBCΔΣ Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>050</sup> al. a<sup>1q</sup> et txt  
 διαγγελον DW fam 1 13 28 604  
 αναγγελον A rell et Φ minn pl et 2<sup>pe</sup>
- † 22. προσεπεσεν D<sup>gr</sup>, επεσεν Sod<sup>1354</sup> } procidit a b c f ff<sub>2</sub> l q r δ vg  
 προσπιπτι W fam 13 } (procidens d)  
 πιπτει NB rell et Sod<sup>050</sup> et cadens e
26. αλλα μαλλον εις το χειρον ελθουσα Plur et W (vide post)  
 „ „ επι το χειρον ελθουσα Sod<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> 604  
 „ „ επι το χειρον (— ελθουσα) D<sup>gr</sup>

*d* and *f* vg<sup>pl</sup> have sed magis deterius habebat, but *b c ff<sub>2</sub>* only sed peius habebat, *e* sed deterius haberet, *q r* sed deterius habebat, *a* ? sed peius deterius habebat, *δ* sed magis in deterius venit.

D alone seems to elide the verb. Possibly the expression επι was supposed to be sufficient without it (cf. syr<sup>pe:h</sup> mut syr<sup>sin</sup>), but 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 retain ελθουσα. Coptic retains the verb.

I give this at length because there has evidently been trouble about the double ελθουσα in ver 27 fin and ver 28. In the following verse 28 a large change of order obtains as to the position of ελθουσα. Indeed W

† This marks the extreme limit of *e*'s great influence on W heretofore in Mark.



(alone) makes the one serve for both: *ελθουσα και ακουσασα περι του ιω εν τω οχλω οπισθεν ηψατο αυτου* eliding the second *ελθουσα*, as D does the first. But as there is a slight space in W after *ελθουσα* we must treat the omission as in *ver* 28. We then get this result:

W *και ακουσασα περι του ιω εν τω οχλω ηψατο αυτου*

D 2<sup>ve</sup> *ακουσασα περι του ιω ελθουσα οπισθεν και ηψατο του ιμ. αυτου εν τω οχλω*

*d* *audito de ihu venit de retro et tetigit vest. ejus inter turbam*  
*i* „ „ „ „ *retro et tetigit vest. ejus in turbam (εις τον οχλον fam 13 28 ΝΣ)*

*a* *cum audisset de Jesu venit a retro et tetigit tunic. illius inter turbam*

*q* *audito de ihu venit retro et tigit vest. ejus inter turba*

*b* „ „ „ „ „ „ *in turba et tetigit vest. ejus*

NB *plur ακουσασα (+τα ΝΒCΔ Eust 33) περι του ιω ελθουσα εν τω οχλω οπισθεν ηψατο . . . fam 1 Sod*<sup>178 1694</sup> *e om εν τω οχλω.*

Mark v. 36. *τον λογον (+ τον Β) λαλουμενον Plur*

*τουτου τον λογον*

D *latt*<sup>1</sup>

Latin = *audito hoc verbo etc*, but *b* simply *audito*. It looks as if the differences arose simply from translation from Latin.

Amplified in retranslation by *copt* and *vg* as: “Jesus autem verbo quod dicebatur audito.”

*ibid.* *παρακουσας ΝΒLΔ<sup>sr</sup> W e 892\*? W-H Sod txt [Male Sod de 2<sup>pe</sup>]*  
*ακουσας AD rell omn Sod*<sup>750</sup> *et 2<sup>pe</sup> (e sil. Cronin) et verss*

37. *παρακολουθησαι D<sup>sr</sup> W fam 1 28 124* } This bears on the wording  
 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 } of Mark in xvi. 17

*συνακολουθησαι ΝΒ rell et Sod*<sup>750</sup> } *παρακολ.*

*ακολουθησαι ΑΚΠ\* minn aliq; εισελθειν Sod*<sup>369</sup> *, e introire.*

vi. 2. *δοθεισα τουτω ΝΒCΛΔ 892 W-H txt*

*δοθεισα αυτω D rell et W et Sod txt*

The Latins have *illi* for the most part (*ei a e*) and retranslation is a more probable influence here for this change than anything else.

5. *εκει ποιησαι ουδεμιαν δυναμιν ΝΒCΛΔ fam 1 [non 118] 273*  
 892 *W-H (εκ. ποι. ουδεμιν sic Sod*<sup>750</sup>)

*εκει ουδεμιαν ποιησαι δυναμιν D a d Orig*<sup>bis</sup> *Hier*

*εκει ουδεμιαν δυναμιν ποιησαι A plur fam<sup>r</sup> et Sod txt [Male de fam<sup>r</sup>]*

*sed ουκετι ποιησαι δυναμιν W (-εκει)*

9. See Latin and five varying Greek forms.

19. *quaerebat a b c d i q r (hiant e k) et εξητει C\**

*volebat f ff2 l δ vg et Gr omn rell et WΔ ηθελεν*

20. *ακουσας Unc et plur*

*ακουων 28 157 Paris*<sup>97</sup> *min al*<sup>30</sup> *audiens b f i r*

*ακουσας* is much more correct here, therefore how came *ακουων* into 28 *al.* except via Latin?

Mark

- vi. 24. του βαπτιζοντος **NBLA**<sup>gr</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup> [*non* 28] + *Sod*<sup>050 sol</sup> et *Sod*<sup>txt</sup>  
 του βαπτιστου **DW** *rell omn minn et latt copt*  
 25. του βαπτιζοντος **L** 604 892 only!  
 του βαπτιστου **NBA** 2<sup>pe</sup> *rell*!  
 36. εγγιστα **D** 604 et *it vg proximas (praeter δ om. Habet*  
*vicos supra κυκλω !)*

κυκλω **NBW** *rell*

[Observe in this verse +*iva* before *αγορασωσιν* **D**<sup>gr</sup> alone apparently with **Paris**<sup>97</sup>; *d* has et not *ut*]

- † 40. κατα εκατον και κατα πεντ. **NBD** 21 *boh (literatim) W-H Sod.*  
*ava* „ „ *ava* „ **A** *rell unc minn et sah (literatim)*  
**Ī** (– *ava prim*) και *ava* **N** **W** (– *ava sec 33 c l r Orig*) – *ava bis a.*

The Latin *per...per* serves for this, and there could not be a more certain place for *bohairic* influence than this. *Boh* uses **ΚΑΤΑ...ΚΑΤΑ** *literatim*, while *sah* has **ΝΑ...ΝΑ** or **ΝΑΝ...ΝΑΝ**. **W** also uses *ava* (once) and not *κατα*.

50. ελαλ. μετ αυτων *Plur*, but ελαλ. προς αυτους **D**† 33 604, and αυτοις 2<sup>pe</sup>. “*Ad eos*” *a d f ff<sub>2</sub> i q r*, *Ad illos c*, but *b* = “*illis*.”

I refuse absolutely to connect this with a “provincialism” as Gregory and Souter imply by their criticism of other examples adduced previously. This is simply a double recension, and *b* seems to hold the original “*illis*” (as 2<sup>pe</sup> αυτοις) whence μετ αυτων in translation.

51. In the verse following *λιαν* is omitted by **DW**<sup>vid</sup> *Sod*<sup>050 vid</sup> 1 28 273<sup>vid</sup> 604. Here **W** comes to join us (rather exceptionally hereabouts) and with *b* “*abundantius*” (against the latin *plus magis*) witnesses to a base without *λιαν*. The Latin *plus magis*, or *magis plus* of *c* can equally well be a translation of the Greek εκ περισσου or εκ περισσως (περισσως **D**) without *λιαν*. I see two recensions here. [*Confuse Sod fam I<sup>a</sup>.*]

55. χωραν **NBLA** *Sod*<sup>050 et tam φ<sup>a</sup></sup> 33 892 **Paris**<sup>97</sup> *copt W-H Sod txt.*  
 (Again the same group which we have charged with other matters hereabouts, so that the issue is very square as to who holds and who does not hold the original base) against περιχωρον **DW** *unc rell et ΣΦ et 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 minn.*

The Latin of *d* is merely *regionem* it is true, as of *it*<sup>pl</sup>, but *b-q* (together proving their base) say *confinem regionis*, so that either this reproduces περιχωρον, or if *regionem* be basic the double Greek recension is accounted for.

† *Tisch* quotes 2<sup>pe</sup> for *κατα* as does *Horner* following him, but *Cronin* does not report this nor *von Soden* and *Belsheim* prints *ava* uncorrected by *Cronin*. As **Paris**<sup>97</sup> deserts both **N** and **B** here (it generally sides with one or the other) *κατα* seems pretty clearly a preference of **NBD**, for *Origen* opposes with *ava*.

† *Tisch* writes *avrois* here in error as to **D**. Add **Paris**<sup>97</sup> for *προς αυτους*.

Mark

*ibid fin.* Here are any amount of variations, all bearing on retranslation and consideration, the actual basic reading being very doubtful.

vi. 56. *καὶ οσοῖ* (— *av*) **ND** 1 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1435 1443</sup> *contra B* *rell καὶ οσοῖ av* (*vel eav*).

vii. 3. *πυκνα* **NW** *b* (subinde) *f g<sub>2</sub> l vg goth copt*  
*syr aeth*  
*πυγμα* **BD** (*πυκμη*) *rell et ΣΦ minn* } *crebro pugillo aur*  
*(πυγμα Sod*<sup>1443</sup>*) et c ff<sub>2</sub> i q r Orig*  
 (primo *d*, momento *a*. *Om Δ δ sah syr sin. Hiant e k*)

*Subinde* of *b* if basic, as is possible, may have caused the trouble. At any rate retranslation is quite possible here. *W* seems to show that *e k* probably opposed **BD** here, but what they read must remain uncertain. [See my edition of the 'Morgan Gospels,' p. lviii.]

4. *ραντισονται* **NB** 40 53 71 86 179 237 240 244 259 *Euthym*  
*βαπτισονται DA pl et WΣΦ minn al. et Paris*<sup>97</sup> *Orig.*

As to *ραντιζω* cf *Hebr* ix. 13 19 21 x. 22, but especially (not in Concordances) *Apoc* xix. 13 *περαντισμενον P, ερραντισμενον Hipp, περιπεραντισμενον N<sup>c</sup> and περιπεραμμενον N\* (for *βεβαμμενον*) showing that **NB** probably made a deliberate change above at Mark vii. 4. In the *Apoc* the Latins agree as to "sprinkling." [Cf. Merx, p. 70 *ad loc.* *Mc.* vii. 4.]*

*ibid.* *τηρειν* **D** } *d et it*<sup>pl</sup> *vg servare,*  
*κρατειν B rell et WΣΦ minn omn vid* } *sed b tenere*

There must be a reason for these things, and that reason has already been suggested. Unfortunately here *a* (which I have shown elsewhere was probably retranslating from the Greek of **D**) does not express it "quae acceperunt tradita." Whether we are to regard *b*'s "tenere" here as basic I do not know. *c* has *servare* and *e k* are wanting. Above, *tenentes* of *d latt* = *κρατουντες* of all Greeks and **D**, so that *tenere* of *b* may well be basic, *τηρειν* simply **D**'s translation, and *servare* retranslation from **D**. (Cf. ix. 10 *ετηρησαν pro εκρατησαν* 604 alone.)

5. *ταις χερσιν* **DW** 28 2<sup>ne</sup> *solī vid* } must indicate a translation  
*χερσιν Rell.* } change in all probability

14. *ακουσατε* **BDHL** *Sod*<sup>1050</sup> 21 2<sup>ne</sup> 892 *W-H & Sod txt* }  
*ακουετε N rell et W minn et Paris*<sup>97</sup> } *audite latt*

17. *τον οικον* **ND** (**D**) *al. pauc sah boh syr* } most likely from re-  
*οικον B plur et W* } translation

19. *εισερχεται* **D**<sup>gr</sup>  
*εισπορευεται Rell et W (d introiit ut latt rell)*

*ibid.* *εξερχεται* **D**<sup>gr</sup>  
*εκπορευεται B plur (πορευεται Λ, εκπορευονται Sod*<sup>376</sup> *[= Paris*<sup>97</sup>*]*  
*in ed. N.T. contra ed. Schmidtke)*

Mark

- εκβαλλεται **ΝΦΙΙ** *minn*<sup>septem</sup>  
 χωρει **W** (*cf. i et boh*)  
 vii. 24. ηλθεν **M** 28 273 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *Eust<sup>a</sup> Orig*  
 εξηλθεν **ΙΔ** (*εισηλθεν* 245)  
 απηλθεν **Plur et DW** (*abiit Latt*)  
 33. προσλαβομενος **W**  
 απολαβομενος **ΝΒD** *plur minn plur et 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> 892\**  
 επιλαβομενος **E\*Γ** 118-131-209 157 213 604 892\*\* *al<sup>20</sup> et Eust<sup>a</sup> 11*  
 λαβομενος **Δ** 63\*\* *Sod<sup>1091</sup>*  
*adprehendens a l δ vg, sed suscipiens b d i r, accipiens c q,*  
*adciapiens ff<sub>2</sub>, adsumens f*  
 In these cases where the Latins vary so much,† there has  
 been already Greek reaction on them. We must assume  
*suscipiens* of *b d i r* or *accipiens* of *c ff<sub>2</sub> q* to be the more basic.  
 Probably *c* (= *e k*? which are wanting) = *W<sup>sr</sup>*.  
 35. ηνουγησαν **ΒΔ** 1-209 [*non* 118] 892 *W-H Sod txt*, ηνυγησαν **ΝD**  
 ηνοιχθησαν **L** *Sod<sup>1res</sup>* [*Sod<sup>050</sup>*]  
 διηνυγησαν 124 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *διηνυγησαν W*  
 διηνοιχθησαν **AN** *rell et ΣΦ minn pl et 28 Paris<sup>97</sup>*  
 (The latin remains unchanged: *apertae sunt*, and none  
 apparently *adapertae sunt*.)  
 36 *init.* Here also *praecepit* of *latt* is uniform and the Greeks (including  
**W**) agree on *διστειλατο*. Only **Δ** and *Paris<sup>97</sup>* vary with  
*εντετειλατο* [**Δ** repeats at viii. 15 but not *Paris<sup>97</sup>*].  
*ibid.* λεγωσιν **ΝBLW<sup>d</sup>Δ** *et W Sod<sup>050</sup> 28 33 892 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> W-H Sod<sup>txt</sup>*  
*ειπωσιν D rell et ΣΦ minn pl*  
*ibid.* Although **D** *d b c ff<sub>2</sub> i* omit *οσον δε αυτους διστελλετο*, it is  
 noteworthy that **W** (which retains with the other Greeks  
 and *a f g<sub>2</sub> l q vg*) writes *οσω...* = *quanto* of *f g<sub>2</sub> (quando)*  
*vg* so that even here *W<sup>sr</sup>* sympathises with Latin.  
*ibid.* περισσοτεως **ΝDW<sup>d</sup>** 61 604 *Sod<sup>1442</sup> δ 362*  
 περισσοτερον **B** *rell et W*  
 37. υπερεκπερισσως **DU** *fam* 1 435 604  
 υπερπερισσω **W.** *υπερπερισσου* **Ν** *Sod<sup>1454</sup>*  
 παντες **W<sup>d</sup>** } *eo amplius latt*  
 υπερπερισσως **ΝB** *et ΣΦ minn pl vid*  
 viii. 5. ηρωτα **ΝBLΔ** 892 *Paris<sup>97</sup> W-H*  
 ηρωτησεν **W**  
 επηρωτησεν **M** *Sod<sup>1385</sup>*  
 επηρωτα **D** *rell et ΣΦ Sod<sup>txt</sup>*  
*interrogavit it omn (praeter a interrogabat)*  
 6. παραγγελλει **ΝBD<sup>sr</sup>L** 892 *l vg<sup>D<sup>FLQRY</sup></sup> W-H Sod. vel παρηγγειλε*  
*rell et latt<sup>pl</sup> praecepit (παραγγειλας Sod<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup>).*

† See the other Lists where they do not vary among themselves.

Mark

- επιταξε Origen (= latt praecepit, vi. 27 39)  
 viii. 7. παρεθηκεν N\* tantum et Tisch<sup>ts</sup>  
 εκελευσεν παρατειθηναι D (jussit latt sah aeth?)  
 ειπεν παρατιθηναι BLΔN<sup>a</sup> 179 372 892 Sod<sup>351 1341 1442</sup> W-H  
 Sod. (ειπεν παρατεθηναι A c<sup>sr</sup> † (Φ)) cf latt apponi  
 ειπεν παραθειναι GM\*NUVXΠΣ et W 2<sup>pe</sup> al. cf syr copt  
 ειπεν παραθηναι EFHKSW<sup>d</sup> Γ 28 al. mult  
 ειπεν παραθετε C 33 (Paris<sup>97</sup>)

Cf verss. *Male Tisch de d* "dixit pro jussit." *Habet d*: "et gratias agens dixit (ob D<sup>sr</sup> και ευχαριστησας pro και ευλογησας) et ipsos jussit adponi."

Cf compositionem et contextum in docum. diversis.

- viii. 12. ζητει σημειον NBCDLΔ Sod<sup>7050</sup> fam 1 28 33 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 892  
 Paris<sup>97</sup> W-H Sod.

quaerit signum a b c d (quaeret) ff<sub>2</sub> i l δ vg<sup>lur</sup> copt aeth syr  
 σημειον επιζητει AN rell et WΣΦ Orig  
 signum quaerit f g<sub>1.2</sub> q r vg<sup>alio</sup> goth arm

N.B.—Here, with differing order, the simple *quaerit* is constant among Latins. This kind of thing is quite different from what occurs in the next verse viii. 13 where NΣ substitute καταλιπων for αφεις. This is simply *ex* Matthew.

- viii. 15. ορατε βλεπετε NB most and WΣ (Φ: ορατε και βλεπετε)  
 but D Sod<sup>7050 203</sup> fam 1 2 2<sup>pe</sup> omit ορατε, and Δ 604 omit βλεπετε.  
 The Latins (all except c f g<sub>2</sub> l gat aur vg) and syr sin only use one  
 expression, but this varies: a k vg<sup>t</sup> syr sin using *cavete*

while: b d ff<sub>2</sub> i q r use *videte*

Over ορατε in Δ stands †cavete  
videte

In view of all that has passed before it is probable that either *cavete* or *videte* is basic. *Cavete* may have grown out of *videte*, and ορατε βλεπετε out of *cavete*.

- viii. 17. πεπ. εχετε την καρδιαν υμων Plur et W f g<sub>2</sub> l vg (habetis)  
 εχοντες 28

πεπ. εστιν η καρδια υμων D<sup>sr</sup> a q syr  
 πεπ. υμων εστιν η καρδια Sod<sup>7050</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup>  
 πεπ. εισι αι καρδιαι υμων b c d ff<sub>2</sub> i (hiat k)  
 [Male Sod. de W; non accurate de latt. et d].

Sah: your heart (is) hard. Boh: Is your heart hardened.

23. This whole verse shows signs of peculiar handling. D starts off  
 with λαβομενος την χειρα for επιλαβομενος της χειρος, as to  
 which, curiously enough, all other Greeks are agreed among  
 themselves for *adpraehendi manum* of d (*adpraehensa manu*  
 of a c k δ, *adprehendit manum* of b i q r, *adprehendens manum*

† "παρεθηναι is the reading commended by the usage of the language."  
Buttmann, Blass.

of *f ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>1.2</sub> l vg*). For του τυφλου W 1 28 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 substitute αυτου against Latin, J 131 229 238 Sod<sup>1054 3017 vid</sup> conflate αυτου του τυφλου, as *diatess.*

For εξηνεγκεν NBCL(Δ) 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>050 al. duo et txt</sup>, the rest and W have εξαγαγεν. The Latins vary between *duxit* (*b c ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>2</sub> i r gat*), *eduxit* (*d f l δ vg*), *produxit* (*a k*), *eicit* (*q*). Then W alone has ενπτυσας for πτυσας (*exspuens latt*) and adds και before επιθεις with G 1 13 28 273 Sod<sup>duo</sup> and *a b c d* against D<sup>sr</sup>. Paris<sup>97</sup> omits εις before ομματα. For αυτω a few have αυτου but W επ αυτω. For *interrogabat* of *d* and Latins, επηρωτα most, but ηρωτα W 251\* Sod<sup>1333</sup>, επηρωτησεν NΣ, D<sup>sr</sup> has επερωτα. For indirect question ει τι βλεπει of N and most Greeks, all Latins, and *syr goth arm*, BCD<sup>sr</sup>Δ Sod<sup>7050</sup> 372 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *copt aeth* substitute direct oration ει τι βλεπεις, and W has ει βλεπει eliding τι, while *k* alone puts *aliquit* after *videret*. (*βλεπειν* 13 [*non fam*] perhaps a good way out of the difficulty.)

Surely this *must* mean retranslation.

viii. 25 *init.* ειτα παλιν Greeks, but και παλιν D and *et iterum* by *b d ff<sub>2</sub> i k q r* (*c* "et rursus") *syr sin*.

Cf further remarks as to this under caption "Itala as a unit."

*ibid.* και διεβλεψεν NBC\*<sup>sr</sup>LWΔ<sup>sr</sup> *fam* 1 28 Sod<sup>1033</sup>  
και ενεβλεψεν C<sup>2</sup> *boh* (cf *sah aeth aliter*) et vidit *k* (*syr sin*?)  
και ηρξατο αναβλεψαι D *b c d g<sub>2</sub> ff<sub>2</sub> i l r δ vg pers*  
και εποισεν αυτον αναβλεψαι ANX *unc*<sup>11</sup> et ΣΦ *al.* *a f q*.

Om *syr pesh.*

και εποισεν αυτον αναβλεψαι και διεβλεψεν *fam* 13 [*non* 124]

*ibid.* ωστε αναβλεψαι... D *it vg*  
και εβλεψεν N Sod<sup>7050 1443</sup> 348 2<sup>pe</sup> *sah δ, και εβλεπεν* 244 *syr*  
και ενεβλεπεν BL 28 13-69 273 *v<sup>scr</sup> W-H Sod, και*  
*ανεβλεπεν Δ<sup>sr</sup> 346*

και ανεβλεπεν *sic W\*, και ανεβλεψεν FM 124 157 al.*

και ενεβλεψεν A *unc*<sup>14</sup> *al. pl.* (Om. Paris<sup>97</sup>).

26. Compare the different recensions here in *Tisch.*

27. εις καισαριαν D *a b d ff<sub>2</sub> i q r*  
εις τας κωμας καισαριας NB *rell et WΣΦ. c f k l δ vg*

28. ειπαν NBCLΔ Paris<sup>97</sup> (892) *k δ copt syr aeth* [*non Sod*<sup>txt</sup>]  
απεκριθησαν D *unc*<sup>14</sup> et WΣΦ *minn it omn* (*praeter k δ*) *vg goth*  
(*arm ut Luc οι δε αποκρ. ειπάν*)

*ibid.* οτι εις των προφ. NBCL 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *copt (syr) W-H Sod txt*  
[εις των προφ. 2<sup>pe</sup> *test. Muralt Tisch, non Belsh Cronin*]  
ενα των προφ. A *unc*<sup>14</sup> et WΣΦ Sod<sup>7050</sup> *minn et k δ*  
ως ενα των προφ. D Sod<sup>7094 1442</sup> *it vg* (*praeter k*)

29. επηρωτα αυτους NBCLΔ 53 892 2<sup>pe</sup> Sod<sup>1443</sup> et Sod<sup>txt</sup> *a ff<sub>2</sub> q*  
(*c*) *δ copt*

Mark

- λεγει αυτοις A *unc* *rell* et WΣΦ *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *b i l r vg (f k)*  
*goth arm aeth syr (ελεγεν Sod*<sup>1250</sup>)
- viii. 30. ειπωσιν CDG *Sod*<sup>551</sup>  
 λεγωσιν NB *rell* et W (λεγουσιν) ΣΦ *minn*
33. πετρω NB DL 21 *hi soli* et W-H *Sod txt (cf copt lat)*  
 τω πετρω A *unc* *rell* et WΣΦ *minn* et Paris<sup>97</sup>
34. ει τις NBC\*DLΔ et W *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 115 183 2<sup>pe</sup> 604  
 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> *Sod*<sup>309 1089 1341</sup> *fam φβ* *Evst* 31 48  
*it vg arm Orig Orig*<sup>int</sup> *Synops (Ath) W-H Sod.*
- οστις A *unc* *rell*<sup>12</sup> et ΣΦ *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *minn* *rell*<sup>omn</sup> *copt syr*
- ibid.* ακολουθειν C\*DX *unc*<sup>8</sup> et WΦ 1 28 *al*<sup>100</sup> *it*<sup>pl</sup> *vg*  
*goth aeth (adhaerere aeth*<sup>int</sup>) *sah* et *Sod txt*
- ελθειν NABC<sup>2</sup>KLΓΑΠΣΞ *al. c k l gat boh syr*  
*arm Orig*<sup>int</sup> *Synops* et W-H
- ελθειν και ακολουθι Δ δ
- ix. 2. αναγει DW<sup>d</sup> 2<sup>pe</sup>, *d ff*<sub>2</sub> *i q k\*\* ? l* et δ (*super Δ*<sup>gr</sup> *αναφερει*) =  
*ducit. Rell a b c f g n vg duxit, k\** *insefuit.*
- αναφερει NB *rell* *omn* *gr* et WΣΦ *Sod*<sup>050</sup>
3. τις D *d* et *b i* (*ανθρωποι syr pesh pers*)
- γναφους NB *rell* *gr* et WΣΦ *minn* (et 2<sup>pe</sup> *rell*) *copt aeth latt rell*  
*Om. claus. X a n syr sin*

## [Hoc loco incipit Ψ]

6. αποκριθη BC\*LD<sup>gr</sup>Ψ 1 28 33 2<sup>pe</sup> [*Male Sod de c*<sup>scr</sup> et *s*<sup>scr</sup>] 604  
 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Sod*<sup>1435</sup> *fam β k boh W-H Sod txt (απεκριθη N Orig*<sup>bis</sup>)
- λαληση C<sup>3</sup>U\*Φ *al. pauc* } *a c ff*<sub>2</sub> *n q loqueretur, b f i l r*
- λαλησει D *rell pl* et Σ } *r*<sub>2</sub> *vg Tert aeth diceret*
- λαλει W. *ελαλει Sod*<sup>050</sup>. *Cf syr sah*
- ibid.* εκφοβοι γαρ εγενοντο NBCDLΔΨ *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 33 892 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup>  
*Sod*<sup>1443</sup>, *cf latt pl sah W-H Sod txt*
- ησαν γαρ εκφοβοι AN *rell* et WΣΦ *cf f l g vg boh*  
 (The point is not the order as much as ησαν and εγενοντο. Cf. the Latin expressions. *εκφ. γαρ ησαν* Ψ *Sod*<sup>351 s 371</sup>.)
7. εγενετο φωνη NBCLΔΨ 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *boh syr pesh* et δ W-H  
 ηλθεν φωνη D *rell* et *latt omn* (*non δ*) *goth sah syr sin Sod*<sup>txt</sup>  
*[Om ηλθεν vel εγενετο W 1. 7 Sod*<sup>1413</sup> *k (c) ex Matt ?]*
- † 8. εξαπινα NB *plur* et WΣΦ *minn pl*
- ευθεως DW<sup>d</sup> *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 28 66<sup>mg</sup> 69 2<sup>pe</sup> *Sod*<sup>1033 1443</sup> (*statim a d g*<sub>1.2</sub>  
*i l n r vg*) (*c ff*<sub>2</sub> *repente, f confestim, k subito, q continuo*)  
*Om b cum diatess; cf Luc ix. 36*

† Note Marsh's Michaelis vol. i. pt. i. p. 144 as to the "Alexandrian idiom in the N.T." where he says: *εξαπινα* which is used in the Gospel of S. Mark and in the Septuagint (Lev. Numb. Josh. Isai. Psal. 2 Chron.) and of which Thomas Magister says that it is absolutely no Greek word and perfectly spurious, has been found by Kypke in *Jamblichus* (Protrept xx. 125). Not mentioned in Liddell and Scott.

*ibid.* αλλα      ACLXΓΔΠ *unc*<sup>9</sup> et WΦ *Sod*<sup>050</sup> *minn*<sup>pl</sup> *arm Sod*<sup>txt</sup>  
 ει μη      NBDN et W<sup>d</sup>ΣΨ 33 61 892 *Evst* 48 49 et Paris<sup>97</sup>  
                          *Sod*<sup>sex</sup> W-H *txt* (πcα *sah*, εβηλ *boh*)  
 αλλ η      27 *Sod*<sup>551 1284</sup> Laura<sup>A 104</sup> (*teste Soden non Lake*).  
*Latt omni nisi*      *goth alja*      *cf syr* ܐܠܝܐ

This is one of the most peculiar places on record. All the Latins use *nisi*. In *Matt* xvii. 8 the Greeks use ει μη. (In *Luke* it is different: *καὶ ἐν τῷ γενεσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὐρεθῇ Ἰησοῦς μόνος*.)

If ει μη in Greek be original and not drawn from Matthew, or translated from the Latin *nisi*, why should all the other Greeks use αλλα here, which corresponds curiously enough almost *literatim* to the gothic *alja* (German *als*) and to the syriac for *nisi*. In St. Matthew where the Greek is ει μη the Latins have again naturally *nisi*. But according to all rules of criticism, as ει μη is the Matthaean Greek expression, αλλα in St. Mark (being different) should be looked upon with favour (since it could not be drawn from there) especially as W supports the other seventeen uncials which use it and thus *Soden* acts here instinctively. Very few minuscules support the ει μη of NBDNW<sup>d</sup>ΣΨ in Mark.

*Sah* uses εἰρητι in *Matt* (against πcα in Mark) but *boh* uses the same εβηλ in *Matt* as in *Mark*; the syriacs use the same word in *Matt* and *Mark* (in Matthew *goth* is wanting).

Of course Hort forces † ει μη into his text on the strength of NBNW<sup>d</sup>+D (to which add since his day ΣΨ Paris<sup>97</sup>) without a thought of anything except that such a combination must be paramount. But it is nothing of the sort. The syriac did not influence an αλλα in Matthew, so why should it have any influence on ACL *etc* in Mark? That can be ruled out. We are left to face either a translation by two Greek groups of an original Latin *nisi*, or an original αλλα in St. Mark's Greek. We must look into this matter more carefully. Because the Greek of D happens to coincide with that of NB here it need not worry us. On the contrary, D would most probably thus translate the *nisi* of *d*. Why does C desert the NB combination here? Why does L desert it? Why does W desert it? Why does *Sod*<sup>050</sup> desert it? And why Φ? Here L is the most important witness of all against ει μη.

Nowhere else in St. Mark is αλλα translated *nisi* in Latin. But there would certainly be an excuse here in ix. 8 for *nisi* to be rendered back into Greek by αλλα. The proper place then for this small matter is here under the caption of "Two or more Greek Recensions," and once for all it shows very clearly how the authorities are divided. That Ψ joins NB is perfectly natural. We have to explain the defection of CL from the group and their adherence with WΦ *Sod*<sup>050</sup> to the other preponderating side.

As to an argument for retranslation from Latin, a glance at the other

† No other expression will adequately express the matter.





## TEXTUAL CRITICISM

For those who are scholars, the **Two Volume set**  
***Codex B and Its Allies***

(By University of Michigan Professor Herman  
Hoskier - 1914) is still among the best  
explanations of the thousands of  
contradictions between **Codex Sinaiticus**  
and **Codex Vaticanus**,

Author = Hoskier, H. C. (Herman Charles), b. 1864.

Title: Codex B and its allies  
: a study and an indictment

by H.C. Hoskier; Publisher London :  
Bernard Quaritch, 1914.

Author Burgon, John William, 1813- 1888.

Title The causes of the corruption of the  
traditional text of the Holy Gospels; being the  
sequel to the traditional text of the Holy Gospels.

Publisher London, G. Bell, 1896.

There is also the book the "Revision Revised"  
by Oxford Professor John William Burgon  
explains many of the problems  
of modern what is called Textual Criticism  
for those who seek information about  
Ancient Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament.

These books are often available online.

# Concerning History and the Early Church

We recommend, for your potential consideration, the following books:

1) The Seventh General Council (held 787 AD) in which the Worship of Images was established, with copious notes from the Caroline books compiled by order of Charlemagne by Rev John Mendham - 1850

2) Image worship in the Church of Rome by James Endell Tyler

The image-worship of the Church of Rome : proved to be contrary to Holy Scripture and the faith and discipline of the primitive church and to involve contradictory and irreconcilable doctrines within the Church of Rome itself (1847)

3) Primitive Christian Worship by James Endell Tyler

Primitive christian worship, or, The evidence of Holy Scripture and the church, concerning the invocation of saints and angels, and the blessed Virgin Mary (1840)

4) The worship of Mary by James Endell Tyler

**5) The Pope of Rome and the popes of the Oriental Orthodox Church**

by Caesarius Tondini (1875) also makes for interesting reading, even though it is a Roman Catholic work which was approved with the Nihil Obstat (not indexed by the inquisition) notice.

THESE BOOKS are AVAILABLE For FREE ONLINE

# Concerning Christians and Christianity

1. Christians are those who follow the teachings of Jesus Christ.
2. The Teachings of Jesus Christ are explained in the book called the Gospel (Injil) or the New Testament.
3. The New Testament is the First Place to find and record the teachings of Jesus Christ, by those who actually knew Him.
4. The New Testament has never been disproved **archeologically** or **historically**. It has and remains accurate.
5. The New Testament Predicts that certain events will happen in the Future.
7. The Reliability of the Old Testament and the New Testament are clear indications of the accuracy of the New Testament.
8. Jesus Christ did Not fail in His mission on Earth.
9. Jesus Christ Pre-existed. This means that He existed BEFORE the Creation of the World.
10. When Christians worship Jesus Christ, they are NOT worshipping another Human being.
11. Jesus Christ did not become God by performing good works.
12. Christians cannot perform good works in order to go to Heaven. Those who want to find God must admit they are not able to be Perfect or Holy, and that they need the help of God to help them get rid of their Sins.
14. More than 500 Million Christians around the world today are NOT Roman Catholic. The Vatican does NOT speak for Christianity in many situations.

## Concerning Christians and Christianity (2)

15. Judas did NOT die in the place of Jesus Christ on the cross.

16. Jesus Christ had no motive to escape his fate. Jesus Christ was born to communicate His message of Hope and Redemption for mankind.

17. Without the **Blood of Jesus**, it would be **impossible** for those who believe in Jesus Christ to be saved, to have Eternal Life.

18. Christians worship **ONE** God, NOT three Gods.

19. In True Christianity, Historically, **the Trinity is =**

a) God the Father

b) God the Son

c) God the Holy Spirit

20. The worship of Angels or Created Beings, or Creatures or anything except God (God the Father, God the Son [Jesus Christ], and God the Holy Spirit, is forbidden.

21. The Trinity IS NOT = Mary, Joseph and Jesus

22. The Trinity is NOT = Jesus, Joseph and God the Father

23. Gabriel is NOT another name for Jesus Christ.

24. Anyone can become a Christian if they want to.

25. Christianity IS not something that can be done EXTERNALLY.

A person is a Christian because of what they believe **in their Heart**, inside of them. Their own **sincerity before God** is the true test.

26. Those who accept an electronic mark [666] for the purchase of goods, in their right hand or forehead are NOT able to become Christians.

# Concerning History and the Roman Catholic Church

Historic Information on the Roman Catholic Church can be found - in online searches - under the words:

papal, roman catholic, papist, popish, romanist, vatican, popery, romish,

There are many free Ebooks available online and at Google that cover these topics.

There is of course the standard works on the proven history of the Vatican:

**The Two Babylons** by Alexander Hislop, which uses more than 200 ancient Latin and Greek sources.

**The Roman Schism illustrated from the Records of the Early Roman Catholic Church**  
by Rev. Perceval.

Those who have trouble with Vatican documents concerning early Church Councils should conduct their own research into a document called the "Donation of Constantine", which was the false land grant from the Roman Emperors to the Vatican.



# **Saved - How To become a Christian how to be saved**

**A Christian is someone  
who believes the  
following**

***Steps to Take in order to become a  
true Christian, to be Saved & Have a  
real relationship & genuine  
experience with the real God***

**Read, understand, accept and  
believe the following verses from  
the Bible:**

**1. All men are sinners and fall short  
of God's perfect standard**

Romans 3: 23 states that

For all have sinned, and come short of  
the glory of God;



**2. Sin - which is imperfection in our lives - denies us eternal life with God. But God sent his son Jesus Christ as a gift to give us freely Eternal Life by believing on Jesus Christ.**

Romans 6: 23 states

For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

**3. You can be saved, and you are saved by Faith in Jesus Christ. You cannot be saved by your good works, because they are not "good enough". But God's good work of sending Jesus Christ to save us, and our response of believing - of having faith - in Jesus Christ, that is what saves each of us.**

Ephesians 2: 8-9 states

8 For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:

9 Not of works, lest any man should boast.

**4. God did not wait for us to become perfect in order to accept or unconditionally love us. He sent Jesus Christ to save us, even though we are sinners. So Jesus Christ died to save us from our sins, and to save us from eternal separation from God.**

Romans 5:8 states

But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

**5. God loved the world so much that He sent his one and only Son to die, so that by believing in Jesus Christ, we obtain Eternal Life.**

John 3: 16 states

For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

**6. If you believe in Jesus Christ, and in what he did on the Cross for us, by dying there for us, you know for a**

**fact that you have been given  
Eternal Life.**

1 John 5: 13 states

These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.

**7. If you confess your sins to God, he hears you take this step, and you can know for sure that He does hear you, and his response to you is to forgive you of those sins, so that they are not remembered against you, and not attributed to you ever again.**

1 John 1: 9 states

If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

**If you believe these verses, or want to believe these verses, pray the following:**

***" Lord Jesus, I need you. Thank you for dying on the cross for my sins. I open the door of my life and ask you***

***to save me from my sins and give me eternal life. Thank you for forgiving me of my sins and giving me eternal life. I receive you as my Savior and Lord. Please take control of the throne of my life. Make me the kind of person you want me to be. Help me to understand you, and to know you and to learn how to follow you. Free me from all of the things in my life that prevent me from following you. In the name of the one and only and true Jesus Christ I ask all these things now, Amen".***

Does this prayer express your desire to know God and to want to know His love ? If you are sincere in praying this prayer, Jesus Christ comes into your heart and your life, just as He said he would.

**It often takes courage to decide to become a Christian. It is the right decision to make, but It is difficult to fight against part of ourselves that wants to hang on, or to find against that part of our selves that has trouble changing. The good news is**

that you do not need to change yourself. Just Cry out to God, pray and he will begin to change you. God does not expect you to become perfect before you come to Him. Not at all...this is why He sent Jesus...so that we would not have to become perfect before being able to know God.

**Steps to take once you have asked  
Jesus to come into your life**

**Find the following passages in the Bible and begin to read them:**

- 1. Read Psalm 23 (in the middle of the Old Testament - the 1st half of the Bible)**
- 2. Read Psalm 91**
- 3. Read the Books in the New Testament (in the Bible) of John, Romans & I John**
- 4. Tell someone of your prayer and your seeking God. Share that with someone close to you.**
- 5. Obtain some of the books on the list of books, and begin to read**

them, so that you can understand more about God and how He works.

6. Pray, that is - just talk to and with God, thank Him for saving you, and tell him your fears and concerns, and ask him for help and guidance.

7. email or tell someone about the great decision you have made today !!!

---

Does the "*being saved*" process only work for those who believe ?

For the person who is not yet saved, their understanding of **1) their state of sin and 2) God's** personal love and care for them, **and His desire and ability to save them....is what enables anyone to become saved.**

So yes, the "being saved" process works only for those

who believe in Jesus Christ and Him only, and place their faith in Him and in His work done on the Cross.

...and if so , then how does believing save a person?

Believing saves a person because of what it allows God to do in the Heart and Soul of that person.

But it is not simply the fact of a "belief". The issue is not having "belief" but rather what we have a belief about.

IF a person believes in **Salvation by Faith Alone in Jesus Christ** (ask us by email if this is not clear), then **That belief** saves them. Why ? because they are magical ? No, because of the sovereignty of God, because of what God does to them, when they ask him into their heart & life. When a person decides to place their faith in Jesus Christ and **ask Him** to forgive them of

their sins and invite Jesus Christ into their life & heart, **this** is what saves them – *because of* what God does for them at that moment in time.

At that moment in time when they sincerely believe and ask God to save them (as described above), God takes the life of that person, and in accordance with the will of that human, having requested God to save them from their sins through Jesus Christ – God takes that person's life and sins [all sins past, present and future], and allocates them to the category: of "*one of those people who Accepted the Free Gift of Eternal Salvation that God offers*".

From that point forward, their sins are no longer counted against them, because that is an account that is paid by the shed blood of Jesus Christ. And there is no person that could ever sin so much, that God's love would not be good enough for them, or that would somehow not be able to be covered by the penalty of



death that Jesus Christ paid the price for. (otherwise, sin would be more powerful than Jesus Christ – which is not true).

Sometimes, People have trouble believing in Jesus Christ because of two extremes:

First the extreme that they are *not* sinners (usually, this means that a person has not committed a "serious" sin, such as "murder", but God says that **all sins separates us from God**, even supposedly-small sins. We – as humans – tend to evaluate sin into more serious and less serious categories, because we do not understand just how serious "small" sin is).

Since we are all sinners, we all have a need for God, in order to have eternal salvation.

Second the extreme that they are *not good enough* for Jesus Christ to save them. This is basically done by those who reject the Free offer of Salvation by Christ Jesus because those people are -literally – **unwilling**

to believe. After death, they will believe, but they can only chose Eternal Life BEFORE they die. The fact is that all of us, are not good enough for Jesus Christ to save them. That is why Paul wrote in the Bible "**For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God**" (Romans 3:23).

Thankfully, that is not the end of the story, because he also wrote " **For the wages of sin *is* death; but the gift of God *is* eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.**"(Romans 6: 23)

That Free offer of salvation is clarified in the following passage:

John 3: 16 **For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.**  
17 **For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.**

# **Prayers that count**

## **The prayers that God hears**

**We don't make the rules any more than you do. We just want to help others know how to reach God, and know that God cares about them personally.**

**The only prayers that make it to Heaven where God dwells are those prayers that are prayed directly to Him "through Jesus Christ" or "*in the name of Jesus Christ*".**

**God hears our prayers because we obey the method that God has established for us to be able to reach him. If we want Him to hear us, then we must use the methods that He has given us to communicate with Him.**

**And he explains - in the New Testament - what that method is: talking to God (praying) in accordance with God's will - and coming to Him in the name of Jesus Christ. Here are some examples of that from the New Testament:**

**(Acts 3:6) Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk.**

**(Acts 16:18) And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour.**

**(Acts 9:27) But Barnabas took him, and brought *him* to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.**

**(2 Cor 3:4) And such trust have we through Christ to God-ward: (i.e. toward God)**

**(Gal 4:7) Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.**

**(Eph 2:7) That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding [spiritual] riches of his grace in *his* kindness toward us through Christ Jesus.**

**(Phil 4:7) And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.**

**(Acts 4:2) Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead.**

**(Rom 1:8) First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world.**

**(Rom 6:11) Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin,**

but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

(Rom 6:23) For the wages of sin *is* death; but the gift of God *is* eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

(Rom 15:17) I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ in those things which pertain to God.

(Rom 16:27) To God only wise, *be* glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen.

(1 Pet 4:11) ...if any man minister, *let him do it* as of the ability which God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

(Gal 3:14) That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the [Holy] Spirit through faith.

**(Titus 3:6) Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour;**

**(Heb 13:21) Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.**

**Anyone who has questions is encouraged to contact us by email, with the address that is posted on our website.**

---

### **Note for Foreign Language and International Readers & Users**

**Foreign Language Versions of the Introduction and Postscript/Afterword will be included (hopefully) in future editions.**

## IF a person wanted to become a Christian, what would they pray ?

God, I am praying this to you so that you will help me. Please help me to want to know you better. Please help me to become a Christian

God I admit that I am not perfect. I understand that you cannot allow anyone into Heaven who is not perfect and Holy. I understand that if I believe in Jesus Christ and in what He did, that God you will see my life through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and that this will allow me to have eternal life and know that I am going to Heaven.

God, I admit that I have sin and things in my life that are not perfect. I know I have sinned in my life. Please forgive me of my sins. I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, that He came to Earth to save those who ask Him, and that He died to pay the penalty for all of my sins.

I understand that Jesus physically died and physically arose from the dead, and that God can forgive me because of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. I thank you for dying for me, and for paying the price for my sins. I accept to believe in you, and I thank you Lord God from all of my heart for your help and for sending your Son to die and raise from the Dead.

I pray that you would help me to read your word the Bible. I renounce anything in my life, my thoughts and my actions that is not from you, and I do this in the name of Jesus Christ. Help me to not be spiritually deceived. Help me to grow and learn how to have a strong Christian walk for you, and to be a good example, with your help. Help me to have and develop a love of your word the Bible, and please bring to my life, people and situations that will help me to understand how to live my life as your servant. Help me to learn how to share the good news with those who may be willing to learn or to know. I ask these things in the name of Jesus Christ, and I thank you for what you have done for me, Amen.

**Please Remember: Christianity is NEVER forced. No one can force anyone to become a Christian. God does NOT recognize any desire for Him, unless it is genuine and motivated from the inside of each of us.**



**Prayers for help to God**

**In MANY LANGUAGES**

**For YOU, for US, for your Family**

Dear God,

Thank you that this New Testament has been released so that we are able to learn more about you.

Please help the people responsible for making this Electronic book available. Please help them to be able to work fast, and make more Electronic books available. Please help them to have all the resources, the money, the strength and the time that they need in order to be able to keep working for You.

Please help those that are part of the team that help them on an everyday basis. Please give them the strength to continue and give each of them the spiritual understanding for the work that you want them to do. Please help each of them to not have fear and to remember that you are the God who answers prayer and who is in charge of everything.

I pray that you would encourage them, and that you protect them, and the work & ministry that they



## 5 minutos a ayudar excepto otros - diferencie eterno

Dios querido,

gracias que se ha lanzado este nuevo testamento de modo que poder aprender más sobre usted.

Ayude por favor a la gente responsable de hacer este Ebook disponible. Ayúdele por favor a poder trabajar rápidamente, y haga que más Ebooks disponible por favor le ayuda a tener todos los recursos, los fondos, la fuerza y el tiempo que necesitan para poder guardar el trabajar para usted.

Ayude por favor a los que sean parte del equipo que les ayuda sobre una base diaria. Por favor déles la fuerza para continuar y para dar a cada uno de ellos la comprensión espiritual para el trabajo que usted quisiera que hicieran. Ayude por favor a cada uno de ellos a no tener miedo y a no recordar que usted es el dios que contesta a rezo y que está a cargo de todo.

Ruego que usted los animara, y que usted los proteja, y el trabajo y el ministerio que están contratados adentro. Ruego que usted los protegiera contra las fuerzas espirituales que podrían dañarlas o retardarlas abajo. Ayúdeme por favor cuando utilizo este nuevo testamento también para pensar en ellas de modo que pueda rogar para ellas y así que pueden continuar ayudando a más gente. Ruego que usted me diera un amor de su palabra santa, y que usted me daría la sabiduría y el discernimiento espirituales para conocerle mejor y para entender los tiempos que estamos adentro y cómo ocuparse de las dificultades que me enfrentan con cada día. Señor God, me ayuda a desear conocerle mejor y desear ayudar a otros cristianos en mi área y alrededor del mundo. Ruego que usted diera el Web site y los de Ebook el equipo y los que trabajan en que les ayudan su sabiduría. Ruego que usted ayudara a los miembros individuales de su familia (y de mi familia) espiritual a no ser engañado, pero entenderle y desear aceptarle y seguir de cada manera. y pido que usted haga estas cosas en el nombre de Jesús, amen, ¿

(por qué lo hacemos tradujeron esto a muchas idiomas?

Porque necesitamos a tanto rezo como sea posible,

y a tanta gente que ruega para nosotros y el este ministerio tan a menudo como sea posible. Gracias por su ayuda.

El rezo es una de las mejores maneras que usted puede ayudarnos más).

# Hungarian

Hungary, Hungarian, Hungary Hungarian Maygar Prayer Jezus Krisztus  
Imadsag hoz Isten Hogyan viselkedni Imadkozik hoz tud hall az en m  
viselkedni kerdez ad segit szamomra

## **Hungarian - Prayer Requests (praying / Talking) to God - explained in Hungarian Language**

Beszélő -hoz Isten , a Alkotó -ból Világegyetem , a Lord :

1. amit ön akar ad számomra a bátorság -hoz imádkozik a  
dolog amit Vennem kell imádkozik

2. amit ön akar ad számomra a bátorság -hoz hisz ön és  
elfogad amit akrsz így csinálni életemmel , helyett én  
feleml az én -m saját akarat ( szándék ) fenti öné.

3. amit ön akar add nekem segít -hoz nem enged az én -m  
fél -ból ismeretlen -hoz válik a kifogás , vagy a alap értem  
nem -hoz szolgál you.

4. amit ön akar add nekem segít -hoz lát és -hoz megtanul  
hogyan viselkedni volna a szellemi erő Szükségem van (   
átmenő -a szó a Biblia ) egy ) részére a esemény előre és b  
betű ) részére az én -m saját személyes szellemi utazás.

5. Amit ön Isten akar add nekem segít -hoz akar -hoz szolgál  
Ön több

6. Amit ön akar emlékeztet én -hoz -val beszél ön  
prayerwhen ) Én csalódott vagy -ban nehézség , helyett  
kipróbálás -hoz határozat dolog én magam egyetlen átmenő  
az én -m emberi erő.

7. Amit ön akar add nekem Bölcsesség és egy szív töltött -  
val Bibliai Bölcsesség azért ÉN akar szolgál ön több  
hatékonyan.

8. Amit ön akar adjon nekem egy -t vágy -hoz dolgozószoba  
-a szó , a Biblia ,( a Új Végrendelet Evangélium -ból Budi ) ,  
-ra egy személyes alap

9. amit ön akar ad segítség számomra azért ÉN képes -hoz  
észrevesz dolog -ban Biblia ( -a szó ) melyik ÉN tud  
személyesen elmond -hoz , és amit akarat segítsen nekem ért  
amit akrsz én -hoz csinál életemben.

10. Amit ön akar add nekem nagy ítélőképesség , -hoz ért  
hogyan viselkedni megmagyaráz -hoz másikk ki ön , és  
amit ÉN akar képesnek lenni megtenni megtanul hogyan  
viselkedni megtanul és tud hogyan viselkedni kiáll mellett  
ön és én -a szó ( a Biblia )

11. Amit ön akar hoz emberek ( vagy websites ) életemben  
ki akar -hoz tud ön és én , ki van erős -ban -uk pontos  
megértés -ból ön ( Isten ) ; és Amit ön akar hoz emberek (   
vagy websites ) életemben ki lesz képes -hoz bátorít én -hoz  
pontosan megtanul hogyan viselkedni feloszt a Biblia a szó -  
ból igazság ( 2 Korócsin 215:).

12. Amit ön akar segítsen nekem -hoz megtanul -hoz volna  
nagy megértés körülbelül melyik Biblia változat van legjobb  
 , melyik van a leg--bb pontos , és melyik birtokol a leg--bb  
szellemi erő & erő , és melyik változat egyeztet -val a  
eredeti kézirat amit ön ihletett a írói hivatás -ból Új  
Végrendelet -hoz ír.

13. Amit ön akar ad segít számomra -hoz használ időm -ban  
egy jó út , és nem -hoz elpusztít időm -ra Hamis vagy üres  
módszer közelebb kerülni -hoz Isten ( de amit van nem

hűségesen Bibliai ), és hol azok módszer termel nem hosszú ideje vagy tartós szellemi gyümölcs.

14. Amit ön akar ad segítség számomra -hoz ért mit tenni keres -ban egy templom vagy egy istentisztelet helye , mi fajta -ból kérdés -hoz kérdez , és amit ön akar segítsen nekem -hoz talál hívők vagy egy lelkész -val nagy szellemi bölcsesség helyett könnyű vagy hamis válaszol.

15. amit ön akar okoz én -hoz emlékszik -hoz memorizál -a szó a Biblia ( mint Rómaiak 8), azért ÉN tud volna ez szívemben és volna az én -m törődik előkészített , és lenni kész ad egy válaszol -hoz másikk -ból remél amit Nekem van körülbelül ön.

16. Amit ön akar hoz segít számomra azért az én -m saját teológia és tételek -hoz egyetérteni -a szó , a Biblia és amit ön akar folytatódik segíteni neki én tud hogyan az én -m megértés -ból doktrína lehet közművesített azért az én -m saját élet , életmód és megértés folytatódik -hoz lenni záró -hoz amit akrsz ez -hoz lenni értem.

17. Amit ön akar nyit az én -m szellemi bepillantás ( következtetés ) több és több , és amit hol az én -m megértés vagy észrevétel -ból ön van nem pontos , amit ön akar segítsen nekem -hoz megtanul ki Jézus Krisztus hűségesen van.

18. Amit ön akar ad segít számomra azért ÉN akar képesnek lenni megtenni szétválaszt akármi hamis rítusok melyik Nekem van függés -ra , -ból -a tiszta tanítás -ban Biblia , ha akármi miből Én alábbiak van nem -ból Isten , vagy van ellenkező -hoz amit akrsz -hoz tanít minket körülbelül alábbiak ön.

19. Amit akármilyen kényszerít -ből rossz akar nem eltesz akármilyen szellemi megértés melyik Nekem van , de eléggé amit ÉN akar megtart a tudás -ból hogyan viselkedni tud ön és én nem -hoz lenni tévedésben lenni ezekben a napokban -ből szellemi csalás.

20. Amit ön akar hoz szellemi erő és segít számomra azért ÉN akar nem -hoz lenni része a Nagy Esés El vagy -ből akármilyen mozgalom melyik akar lenni lelkileg utánczó -hoz ön és én -hoz -a Szent Szó

21. Amit ha van akármilyen amit Nekem van megtett életemben , vagy bármilyen módon amit Nekem van nem alperes -hoz ön ahogyan ettem kellett volna volna és ez minden megakadályozás én -ből egyik gyaloglás veled , vagy birtoklás megértés , amit ön akar hoz azok dolog / válasz / esemény vissza bele az én -m törődik , azért ÉN akar lemond őket nevében Jézus Krisztus , és mind az összes -uk hat és következmény , és amit ön akar helyettesít akármilyen üresség ,sadness vagy kétségbeesés életemben -val a Öröm -ből Lord , és amit ÉN akar lenni több fókuszálva tanulás -hoz követ ön mellett olvasó -a szó , a Biblia

22. Amit ön akar nyit az én -m szemek azért ÉN akar képesnek lenni megtenni világosan lát és felismer ha van egy Nagy Csalás körülbelül Szellemi téma , hogyan viselkedni ért ez jelenség ( vagy ezek esemény ) -ből egy Bibliai perspektíva , és amit ön akar add nekem bölcsesség -hoz tud és így amit ÉN akar megtanul hogyan viselkedni segít barátaim és szeretett egyek ( rokon ) nem lenni része it.

23. Amit ön akar biztosít amit egyszer az én -m szemek van kinyitott és az én -m törődik ért a szellemi jelentőség -ből időszaki esemény bevitel hely a világon , amit ön akar előkészít szívem elfogadtatni magam -a igazság , és amit ön akar segítsen nekem ért hogyan viselkedni talál bátorság és

erő átmenő -a Szent Szó , a Biblia. Nevében Jézus Krisztus ,  
Én kérdezek mindezekért igazol kívánságom -hoz lenni -ban  
megállapodás -a akarat , és Én kérdezés részére -a  
bölcsség és kicsit bérelni szerelem -ből Igazság Ámen

=====

Több alul -ból Oldal  
Hogyan viselkedni volna Örökélet

=====

Vagyunk boldog ha ez oldalra dől ( -ból imádság kereslet -  
hoz Isten ) van képes -hoz támogat ön. Mi ért ez május nem  
lenni a legjobb vagy a leg--bb hatásos fordítás. Mi ért amit  
vannak sok különböző ways -ból kifejezhető gondolkodás és  
szöveg. Ha önnek van egy javaslat részére egy jobb fordítás  
, vagy ha tetszene neked -hoz fog egy kicsi összeg -ból idő  
-hoz küld javaslatok hozzánk , lesz lenni ételadag ezer -ból  
más emberek is , ki akarat akkor olvas a közművesített  
fordítás. Mi gyakran volna egy Új Végrendelet elérhető -ban  
-a nyelv vagy -ban nyelvek amit van ritka vagy régi. Ha ön  
látvány részére egy Új Végrendelet -ban egy különleges nyelv  
, legyen szíves ír hozzánk. Is , akarunk hogy biztosak  
legyünk és megpróbál -hoz kommunikál amit néha ,  
megtesszük felajánl könyv amit van nem Szabad és amit  
csinál ár pénz. De ha ön nem tud ad néhányuk elektronikus  
könyv , mi tud gyakran csinál egy cserél -ből elektronikus  
könyv részére segít -val fordítás vagy fordítás dolgozik.  
Csinálsz nem kell lenni profi munkás , csak kevés szabályos  
személy akit érdekel ételadag. Önnek kellene volna egy  
számítógép vagy önnek kellene volna belépés -hoz egy  
számítógép -on -a helyi könyvtár vagy kollégium vagy  
egyetem , óta azok általában volna jobb kapcsolatok -hoz  
Internet.





=====

## **Parlando al dio, il creatore dell'universo, il signore:**

**1. che darestes me al coraggio pregare le cose di che ho bisogno per pregare**

2. che darestes me al coraggio crederli ed accettare che cosa desiderate fare con la mia vita, anziché me che exalting il miei propri volontà (intenzione) sopra il vostro.

3. che mi darestes l'aiuto per non lasciare i miei timori dello sconosciuto trasformarsi in nelle giustificazioni, o la base per me per non servirlo.

4. che mi darestes l'aiuto per vedere ed imparare come avere la resistenza spiritosa io abbia bisogno (con la vostra parola bibbia) di a) per gli eventi avanti e b) per il mio proprio viaggio spiritoso personale.

5. Che dio mi darestes l'aiuto per desiderare servirli di più

6. Che mi ricordereste comunicare con voi (prayer)when io sono frustrati o in difficoltà, invece di provare a risolvere le cose io stesso soltanto con la mia resistenza umana.

7. Che mi darestes la saggezza e un cuore si è riempito di saggezza biblica in modo che li servissi più efficacemente.

8. Che mi darestes un desiderio studiare la vostra parola, la bibbia, (il nuovo gospel del Testamento di John), a titolo personale,

9. che darestes ad assistenza me in modo che possa notare le cose nella bibbia (la vostra parola) a cui posso riferire personalmente ed a che lo aiuterà a capire che cosa lo desiderate fare nella mia vita.

10. Che mi dareste il discernment grande, per capire come spiegare ad altri che siate e che potrei imparare come imparare e sapere levarsi in piedi in su per voi e la vostra parola (bibbia)

11. Che portereste la gente (o i Web site) nella mia vita che desidera conoscerla e che è forte nella loro comprensione esatta di voi (dio); e quello portereste la gente (o i Web site) nella mia vita che potrà consigliarmi imparare esattamente come dividere la bibbia la parola della verità (2 coda di todo 2:15).

12. Che lo aiutereste ad imparare avere comprensione grande circa quale versione della bibbia è la cosa migliore, che è la più esatta e che ha la resistenza & l'alimentazione più spiritose e che la versione accosente con i manoscritti originali che avete ispirato gli autori di nuovo Testamento scrivere.

13. Che dareste l'aiuto me per usare il mio tempo in un buon senso e per non sprecare il mio tempo sui metodi falsi o vuoti di ottenere più vicino al dio (ma a quello non sia allineare biblico) e dove quei metodi non producono frutta spiritosa di lunga durata o durevole.

14. Che dareste l'assistenza me capire che cosa cercare in una chiesa o in un posto di culto, che generi di domande da chiedere e che lo aiutereste a trovare i believers o un pastor con saggezza spiritosa grande anziché le risposte facili o false.

15. di che lo indurreste a ricordarsi per memorizzare la vostra parola la bibbia (quale Romans 8), di modo che posso averlo nel mio cuore e fare la mia prepararsi mente ed è

aspetti per dare una risposta ad altre della speranza che ho circa voi.

16. Che portereste l'aiuto me in modo che la mie proprie teologia e dottrine per accosentire con la vostra parola, la bibbia e che continuereste a aiutarli a sapere la mia comprensione della dottrina può essere migliorata in modo che la miei propri vita, lifestyle e capire continui ad essere più vicino a che cosa lo desiderate essere per me.

17. Che aprireste la mia comprensione spiritosa (conclusioni) di più e più e che dove la mia comprensione o percezione di voi non è esatta, che lo aiutereste ad imparare chi Jesus Christ allineare è.

18. Che dareste l'aiuto me in modo che possa separare tutti i rituali falsi da cui ho dipeso, dai vostri insegnamenti liberi nella bibbia, se c'è ne di che cosa sono seguente non è del dio, o è contrari a che cosa desiderate per insegnarli - circa quanto segue.

19. Che alcune forze della malvagità non toglierebbero la comprensione affatto spiritosa che abbia, ma piuttosto che mantennrei la conoscenza di come conoscerli e non essere ingannato dentro attualmente di inganno spiritoso.

20. Che portereste la resistenza spiritosa ed aiutereste a me in modo che non faccia parte del ritirarsi grande o di alcun movimento che sarebbe spiritual falsificato a voi ed alla vostra parola santa.

21. Quello se ci è qualche cosa che faccia nella mia vita, o qualsiasi senso che non ho risposto a voi come dovrei avere e quello sta impedendomi di camminare con voi, o avere capire, che portereste quei things/responses/events nuovamente dentro la mia mente, di modo che rinuncerei

loro in nome di Jesus Christ e tutte i loro effetti e conseguenze e che sostituireste tutta la emptiness, tristezza o disperazione nella mia vita con la gioia del signore e che di più sarei messo a fuoco sull'imparare seguirli leggendo la vostra parola, bibbia.

22. Che aprireste i miei occhi in modo che possa vedere e riconoscere chiaramente se ci è un inganno grande circa i soggetti spiritosi, come capire questo fenomeno (o questi eventi) da una prospettiva biblica e che mi dareste la saggezza per sapere ed in modo che impari come aiutare i miei amici ed amavo ones (parenti) per non fare parte di esso.

23. Che vi accertereste che i miei occhi siano aperti una volta e la mia mente capisce l'importanza spiritosa degli eventi correnti che avvengono nel mondo, che abbiate preparato il mio cuore per accettare la vostra verità e che lo aiutereste a capire come trovare il coraggio e la resistenza con la vostra parola santa, la bibbia. In nome di Jesus Christ, chiedo queste cose che confermano il mio desiderio essere nell'accordo la vostra volontà e sto chiedendo la vostra saggezza ed avere un amore della verità, Amen.

=====

Più in calce alla pagina  
come avere vita Eterna

=====

Siamo felici se questa lista (delle richieste di preghiera al dio) può aiutarli. Capiamo che questa non può essere la traduzione migliore o più efficace. Capiamo che ci sono molti sensi differenti di esprimere i pensieri e le parole. Se avete un suggerimento per una traduzione migliore, o se

voleste occorrere una piccola quantità di vostro tempo di trasmettere i suggerimenti noi, aiuterete i migliaia della gente inoltre, che allora leggerà la traduzione migliorata. Abbiamo spesso un nuovo Testamento disponibile in vostra lingua o nelle lingue che sono rare o vecchie.

Se state cercando un nuovo Testamento in una lingua specifica, scriva prego noi. Inoltre, desideriamo essere sicuri e proviamo a comunicare a volte quello, offriamo i libri che non sono liberi e che costano i soldi. Ma se non potete permettervi alcuni di quei libri elettronici, possiamo fare spesso uno scambio di libri elettronici per aiuto con la traduzione o il lavoro di traduzione.

Non dovete essere un operaio professionista, solo una persona normale che è interessata nell'assistenza. Dovreste avere un calcolatore o dovreste avere accesso ad un calcolatore alla vostra biblioteca o università o università locale, poiché quelli hanno solitamente collegamenti migliori al Internet. Potete anche stabilire solitamente il vostro proprio cliente LIBERO personale della posta elettronica andando al #### di mail.yahoo.com prego occorrete un momento per trovare l'indirizzo della posta elettronica situato alla parte inferiore o all'estremità di questa pagina. Speriamo che trasmettiate la posta elettronica noi, se questa è di aiuto o di incoraggiamento. Inoltre vi consigliamo metterseli in contatto con riguardo ai libri elettronici che offriamo quello siamo senza costo e

che libero abbiamo molti libri nelle lingue straniere, ma non le disponiamo sempre per ricevere elettronicamente (trasferimento dal sistema centrale verso i satelliti) perché rendiamo soltanto disponibile i libri o i soggetti che sono chiesti. Vi consigliamo continuare a pregare al dio ed a continuare ad imparare circa lui leggendo il nuovo

Testamento. Accogliamo favorevolmente le vostre domande ed osservazioni da posta elettronica.

=====

**Preghiera al dio Caro Dio,** Grazie che questo gospel o questo nuovo Testamento è stato liberato in modo che possiamo impararvi più circa. Aiuti prego la gente responsabile del rendere questo libro elettronico disponibile. Conoscete che chi sono e potete aiutarle.

Aiutale prego a potere funzionare velocemente e renda i libri più elettronici disponibili Aiutali prego ad avere tutte le risorse, i soldi, la resistenza ed il tempo di che hanno bisogno per potere continuare a funzionare per voi. Aiuti prego quelli che fanno parte della squadra che le aiuta su una base giornaliera. Prego dia loro la resistenza per continuare e dare ciascuno di loro la comprensione spiritosa per il lavoro che li desiderate fare. Aiuti loro prego ciascuno a non avere timore ed a non ricordarsi di che siete il dio che risponde alla preghiera e che è incaricato di tutto. Prego che consigliereste loro e che li proteggete ed il lavoro & il ministero che sono agganciati dentro.

Prego che li proteggereste dalle forze spiritose o da altri ostacoli che potrebbero nuoc o ritardarli giù. Aiutalo prego quando uso questo nuovo Testamento anche per pensare alla gente che ha reso questa edizione disponibile, di modo che posso pregare per loro ed in modo da può continuare a aiutare più gente.

Prego che mi dareste un amore della vostra parola santa (il nuovo Testamento) e che mi dareste la saggezza ed il discernment spiritosi per conoscerli meglio e per capire il

Prego che dareste la squadra elettronica e coloro del libro che le aiuta la vostra saggezza.

=====

**PORTUGUESE    PORTUGUESE**

Portuguese Prayer Cristo Pedido a Deus Como orar a Deus  
podem ouvir my pedido perguntar Deus dar ajuda a me

\_\_\_\_\_

Falando ao deus, o criador do universo, senhor:



1. que você daria a mim à coragem pray as coisas que eu necessito pray
2. que você daria a mim à coragem o acreditar e aceitar o que você quer fazer com minha vida, em vez de mim que exalting meus próprios vontade (intenção) acima de seu.
3. que você me daria a ajuda para não deixar meus medos do desconhecido se transformar as desculpas, ou a base para mim para não lhe servir.
4. que você me daria a ajuda para ver e aprender como ter a força espiritual mim necessite (com sua palavra o bible) a) para os eventos adiante e b) para minha própria viagem espiritual pessoal.
5. Que você deus me daria a ajuda para querer lhe servir mais
6. Que você me lembraria falar com você (prayer)when me são frustrados ou na dificuldade, em vez de tentar resolver coisas eu mesmo somente com minha força humana.
7. Que você me daria a sabedoria e um coração encheu-se com a sabedoria bíblica de modo que eu lhe servisse mais eficazmente.
8. Que você me daria um desejo estudar sua palavra, o bible, (o gospel do testament novo de John), em uma base pessoal,
9. que você daria a auxílio a mim de modo que eu pudesse observar coisas no bible (sua palavra) a que eu posso pessoalmente se relacionar, e a que me ajudará compreender o que você me quer fazer em minha vida.
10. Que você me daria o discernment grande, para compreender como explicar a outro que você é, e que eu

poderia aprender como aprender e saber estar acima para você e sua palavra (o bible)

11. Que você traria os povos (ou os Web site) em minha vida que querem o conhecer, e que são fortes em sua compreensão exata de você (deus); e isso você traria povos (ou Web site) em minha vida que poderá me incentivar aprender exatamente como dividir o bible a palavra da verdade (2 timothy 2:15).

12. Que você me ajudaria aprender ter a compreensão grande sobre que versão do bible é a mais melhor, que são a mais exata, e que têm a força & o poder os mais espirituais, e que a versão concorda com os manuscritos originais que você inspirou os autores do testament novo escrever.

13. Que você me daria a ajuda para usar meu tempo em uma maneira boa, e para não desperdiçar minha hora em métodos falsos ou vazios de começar mais perto do deus (mas daquele não seja verdadeiramente bíblico), e onde aqueles métodos não produzem nenhuma fruta espiritual a longo prazo ou durável.

14. Que você me daria o auxílio compreender o que procurar em uma igreja ou em um lugar da adoração, que tipos das perguntas a pedir, e que você me ajudaria encontrar believers ou um pastor com sabedoria espiritual grande em vez das respostas fáceis ou falsas. 15. que você faria com que eu recordasse memorizar sua palavra o bible (tal como Romans 8), de modo que eu pudesse o ter em meu coração e ter minha mente preparada, e estivessem pronto para dar uma resposta a outra da esperança que eu tenho sobre você.

16. Que você me traria a ajuda de modo que meus próprios theology e doutrinas para concordar com sua palavra, o

bible e que você continuaria a me ajudar saber minha compreensão da doutrina pode ser melhorada de modo que meus próprios vida, lifestyle e compreensão continuem a ser mais perto de o que você a quer ser para mim.

17. Que você abriria minha introspecção espiritual (conclusões) mais e mais, e que onde minha compreensão ou percepção de você não são exata, que você me ajudaria aprender quem Jesus Christ é verdadeiramente.

18. Que você me daria a ajuda de modo que eu possa separar todos os rituals falsos de que eu depender, de seus ensinamentos desobstruídos no bible, se alguma de o que eu sou seguinte não são do deus, nem são contrárias a o que você quer nos ensinar - sobre o seguir.

19. Que nenhuma das forças do evil não removeriam a compreensão espiritual que eu tenho, mas rather que eu reteria o conhecimento de como o conhecer e não ser iludido nestes dias do deception espiritual.

20. Que você traria a força espiritual e me ajudaria de modo que eu não seja parte da queda grande afastado ou de nenhum movimento que fosse espiritual forjado a você e a sua palavra holy.

21. Isso se houver qualquer coisa que eu fiz em minha vida, ou alguma maneira que eu não lhe respondi como eu devo ter e aquela está impedindo que eu ande com você, ou ter a compreensão, que você traria aqueles things/responses/events para trás em minha mente, de modo que eu os renunciasses no nome de Jesus Christ, e em todas seus efeitos e conseqüências, e que você substituiria todo o emptiness, sadness ou desespero em minha vida com a alegria do senhor, e que eu estaria focalizado mais na aprendizagem o seguir lendo sua palavra, o bible.

22. Que você abriria meus olhos de modo que eu possa ver e reconhecer claramente se houver um deception grande sobre tópicos espirituais, como compreender este fenômeno (ou estes eventos) de um perspective bíblica, e que você me daria a sabedoria para saber e de modo que eu aprenderei como ajudar a meus amigos e amei (parentes) não ser parte dela.

23. Que você se asseguraria de que meus olhos estejam abertos uma vez e minha mente compreende o significado espiritual dos eventos atuais que ocorrem no mundo, que você prepararia meu coração para aceitar sua verdade, e que você me ajudaria compreender como encontrar a coragem e a força com sua palavra holy, o bible. No nome de Jesus Christ, eu peço estas coisas que confirmam meu desejo ser no acordo sua vontade, e eu estou pedindo sua sabedoria e para ter um amor da verdade, Amen.

=====

Mais no fundo da página  
como ter a vida eternal

=====

Nós estamos contentes se esta lista (de pedidos do prayer ao deus) puder lhe ajudar. Nós compreendemos que esta não pode ser a mais melhor ou tradução a mais eficaz. Nós compreendemos que há muitas maneiras diferentes de expressar pensamentos e palavras. Se você tiver uma sugestão para uma tradução melhor, ou se você gostar de fazer exame de um pouco de seu tempo nos emitir sugestões, você estará ajudando a milhares dos povos também, que lerão então a tradução melhorada. Nós temos frequentemente um testament novo disponível em sua língua ou nas línguas que são raras ou velhas. Se você estiver procurando um testament novo em uma língua específica, escreva-nos por favor.

Também, nós queremos ser certos e tentamos comunicar às vezes isso, nós oferecemos os livros que não estão livres e que custam o dinheiro. Mas se você não puder ter recursos para alguns daqueles livros eletrônicos, nós podemos frequentemente fazer uma troca de livros eletrônicos para a ajuda com tradução ou trabalho da tradução. Você não tem que ser um trabalhador profissional, only uma pessoa regular que esteja interessada na ajuda.

Você deve ter um computador ou você deve ter o acesso a um computador em sua biblioteca ou faculdade ou universidade local, desde que aqueles têm geralmente conexões melhores ao Internet.

Você pode também geralmente estabelecer seu próprio cliente LIVRE pessoal do correio eletrônico indo ao ### de mail.yahoo.com faz exame por favor de um momento para encontrar o endereço do correio eletrônico ficado situado no fundo ou na extremidade desta página. Nós esperamos que você nos emita o correio eletrônico, se este for da ajuda ou do incentivo. Nós incentivamo-lo também contatar-nos a respeito dos livros eletrônicos que nós oferecemos a isso somos sem custo, e

que livre nós temos muitos livros em línguas estrangeiras, mas nós não as colocamos sempre para receber eletronicamente (download) porque nós fazemos somente disponível os livros ou os tópicos que são os mais pedidos. Nós incentivamo-lo continuar a pray ao deus e a continuar a aprender sobre ele lendo o testament novo. Nós damos boas-vindas a seus perguntas e comentários pelo correio eletrônico.



Oro aquel usted haría ayuda el individuo miembros de su familia ( y mi familia ) a no estar espiritualmente engañado , pero a comprender usted y querer a aceptar y seguir usted en todos los días camino. y YO preguntar usted hacer éstos cosas en nombre de Jesús , Amén ,

**Kjære God , Takk skal du ha det denne Ny Testamentet**  
er blitt befridd i den grad at vi er dugelig å høre flere om du.  
Behage hjelpe folket ansvarlig for gjør denne Elektronisk  
bestille anvendelig. Behage hjelpe seg å bli kjøpedyktig  
arbeide rask , og lage flere Elektronisk bøker anvendelig  
Behage hjelpe seg å ha alle ressursene , pengene , det styrke  
og klokken det de nød for at være i stand til oppbevare  
arbeider til deres.

Behage hjelpe dem det er del av teamet det hjelpe seg opp på en hverdags basis. Behage gir seg det styrke å fortsette og gir hver av seg det sprit forståelse for det arbeide det du ønske seg å gjøre.

Behage hjelpe hver av seg å ikke ha rank og å erindre det du er det God hvem svar bønn og hvem er i ledelsen av alt. JEG be det du ville oppmuntre seg , og det du beskytte seg , og det arbeide & ministerium det de er forlovet inne. JEG be det du ville beskytte seg fra det Sprit Presser eller annet obstacles det kunne skade seg eller langsam seg ned.

Behage hjelpe meg når JEG bruk denne Ny Testamentet å likeledes tenke på folket hvem ha fremstilt denne opplag anvendelig , i den grad at JEG kanne be for seg hvorfor de kanne fortsette å hjelpe flere folk JEG be det du ville gir meg en kjærlighet til din Hellig Ord ( det Ny Testamentet ), og det du ville gir meg sprit klokskap og discernment å vite du bedre og å oppfatte perioden det vi lever inne.

Behage hjelpe meg å vite hvor å beskjeftige seg med problemene det JEG er stilt overfor hver dag. Lord God , Hjelpe meg å vil gjerne vite du Bedre og å vil gjerne hjelpe annet Kristen inne meg område og i nærheten verden.

JEG be det du ville gir det Elektronisk bestille lag og dem hvem arbeide med det website og dem hvem hjelpe seg din klokskap. JEG be det du ville hjelpe individet medlemmer av deres slekt ( og meg slekt ) å ikke være spirituallly narret , bortsett fra å oppfatte du og å vil gjerne godkjenne og følge etter etter du inne enhver vei. og JEG anmode du å gjøre disse saker inne navnet av Jesus , Samarbeidsvillig ,

[illegible]

## SWEDISH – SUEDE - SUEDOIS



## Swedish - Prayer Requests (praying / Talking) to God - explained in Swedish Language

Swedish Prayer Bon till Gud Jesus Hur till Be Hur kann  
hora min Hur till fraga Gud till ger hjalp finna ande Ledning  
Talande till Gud , skaparen om Universum , den Vår Herre  
och Frälsare :

1. så pass du skulle ger till jag tapperheten till be sakerna så  
pass Jag nöd till be

2. så pass du skulle ger till jag tapperheten till tro på du och  
accept vad du vilja till gör med min liv , i stället för jag  
upphoja min äga vilja ( avsikt ) över din.

3. så pass du skulle ge mig hjälp till inte låta min rädsla om  
okänd till bli den ursäkta , eller basisten för jag inte till tjäna  
you.

4. så pass du skulle ge mig hjälp till se och till lära sig hur  
till har den ande styrka Jag nöd ( igenom din uttrycka bibeln  
) en ) för händelsen före och b ) för min äga personlig ande  
resa.

5. Så pass du Gud skulle ge mig hjälp till vilja till tjäna Du  
mer

6. Så pass du skulle påminna jag till samtal med du  
prayerwhen ) JAG er frustrerat eller i svårigheten , i stället  
för försökande till besluta sakerna mig själv bara igenom  
min mänsklig styrka.

7. Så pass du skulle ge mig Visdom och en hjärtan fyllt med  
Biblisk Visdom så fakta åt JAG skulle tjäna du mer  
effektivt. 8. Så pass du skulle ge mig en önska till studera  
din uttrycka , bibeln , ( den Ny Testamente Evangelium av  
John ) , på en personlig basis 9. så pass du skulle ger hjälp

till jag så fakta ät JAG er köpa duktig märka sakerna inne om Bibel ( din uttrycka ) vilken JAG kanna personlig berätta till , och den där vill hjälpa mig förstå vad du vilja jag till gör i min liv.

10. Så pass du skulle ge mig stor discernment , till förstå hur till förklara till självaste vem du er , och så pass JAG skulle kunde lära sig hur till lära sig och veta hur till löpa upp för du och mig din uttrycka ( bibeln )

11. Så pass du skulle komma med folk ( eller websites ) i min liv vem vilja till veta du och mig , vem de/vi/du/ni är stark i deras exakt förståndet av du ( Gud ); och Så pass du skulle komma med folk ( eller websites ) i min liv vem vilja kunde uppmuntra jag till ackurat lära sig hur till fördela bibeln orden av sanning Timothy 215:).

12. Så pass du skulle hjälpa mig till lära sig till har stor förståndet om vilken Bibel version är bäst , vilken är mest exakt , och vilken har mest ande styrka & förmåga , och vilken version samtycke med det original manuskripten så pass du inspirerat författarna om Ny Testamente till skriva.

13. Så pass du skulle ger hjälp till jag till använda min tid i en god väg , och inte till slösa min tid på Falsk eller tom metoderna till komma närmare till Gud ( utom så pass blandar inte sant Biblisk ), och var den här metoderna produkter ingen for länge siden tid eller varande ande frukt.

14. Så pass du skulle ger hjälp till jag till förstå vad till blick för i en kyrka eller en ställe av dyrkan , vad slagen av spörsmålen till fråga , och så pass du skulle hjälpa mig till finna tro på eller en pastor med stor ande visdom i stället för lätt eller falsk svar.

15. så pass du skulle orsak jag till minas till minnesmärke din uttrycka bibeln ( sådan som Romersk 8), så fakta ät JAG kanna har den i min hjärtan och har min sinne beredd , och vara rede till å ger en svar till självaste om hoppa på att Jag har omkring du.

16. Så pass du skulle komma med hjälp till jag så fakta ät min äga theology och doktrin till samtycke med din uttrycka , bibeln och så pass du skulle fortsätta till hjälpa mig veta hur min förståndet av doktrin kanna bli förbättrat så fakta ät min äga liv , livsform och förståndet fortsatt till vara nöjer till vad slut du vilja den till vara för jag.

17. Så pass du skulle öppen min ande inblicken ( sluttningarna ) mer och mer , och så pass var min förståndet eller uppfattningen av du är inte exakt , så pass du skulle hjälpa mig till lära sig vem Jesus Christ sant är.

18. Så pass du skulle ger hjälp till jag så fakta ät JAG skulle kunde skild från någon falsk ritual vilken Jag har bero på , från din klar undervisning inne om Bibel , eventuell om vad JAG följer är inte av Gud , eller är i strid mot vad du vilja till undervisa oss omkring följande du.

19. Så pass någon pressar av onda skulle inte ta bort någon ande förståndet vilken Jag har , utom hellre så pass JAG skulle hålla kvar kunskap om hur till veta du och mig inte till bli lurat i den här dagen av ande bedrägeri.

20. Så pass du skulle komma med ande styrka och hjälp till jag så fakta ät Jag vill inte till bli del om den Stor Stjärnfall Bort eller av någon rörelse vilken skulle bli spirituallt förfalskad till du och mig till din Helig Uttrycka

21. Så pass om där er något så pass Jag har gjort det min liv , eller någon väg så pass Jag har inte reagerat till du så JAG

skulle har och den där er förhindrande jag från endera vandrare med du , eller har förståndet , så pass du skulle komma med den här sakerna / svaren / händelsen rygg in i min sinne , så fakta ät JAG skulle avsäga sig dem inne om Namn av Jesus Christ , och all av deras verkningen och konsekvenserna , och så pass du skulle sätta tillbaka någon tomhet ,sadness eller förtvivlan i min liv med det Glädje om Vår Herre och Frälsare , och så pass JAG skulle bli mer focusen på inläringen till följa du vid läsande din uttrycka , den Bibel

22. Så pass du skulle öppna min öga så fakta ät JAG skulle kunde klar se och recognize om där er en Stor Bedrägeri omkring Ande ämnena , hur till förstå den här fenomenon ( eller de här händelsen ) från en Biblisk perspektiv , och så pass du skulle ge mig visdom till veta och så så pass Jag vill lära sig hur till hjälp min vännerna och älskat en ( släktingen ) inte bli del om it.

23. Så pass du skulle tillförsäkra så pass en gång min öga de/vi/du/ni är öppnat och min sinne förstår den ande mening av ström händelsen tagande ställe på jorden , så pass du skulle förbereda min hjärtan till accept din sanning , och så pass du skulle hjälpa mig förstå hur till finna mod och styrka igenom din Helig Uttrycka , bibeln. Inne om namn av Jesus Christ , JAG fråga om de här sakerna bekräftande min önska till vara i följe avtalen din vilja , och JAG frågar till deras visdom och till har en kärlek om den Sanning Samarbetsvillig

=====

Mer på botten av Sida  
Hur till har Oändlig Liv

Vi er glad om den här lista över ( bön anmoder till Gud ) är duglig till hjälpa du. Vi förstå den här Maj inte bli den bäst eller mest effektiv översättning. Vi förstå det där de/vi/du/ni är många olik väg av yttranden tanken och orden. Om du har en förslagen för en bättre översättning , eller om du skulle lik till ta en liten belopp av din tid till sända förslag till oss , du vill bli hjälpende tusenden av annan folk också , vem vilja då läsa den förbättrat översättning. Vi ofta har en Ny Testamente tillgänglig i din språk eller i språken så pass de/vi/du/ni är sällsynt eller gammal. Om du er sett för en Ny Testamente i en bestämd språk , behaga skriva till oss. Också , vi behov till vara säker och försök till meddela så pass ibland , vi gör erbjudande bokna så pass blandar inte Fri och så pass gör kostnad pengar. Utom om du kan icke har råd med det något om den här elektronisk bokna , vi kanna ofta gör en byta av elektronisk bokna för hjälp med översättning eller översättning verk.

Du hade inte till vara en professionell arbetaren , enda et par regelbunden person vem er han intresserad i hjälpende. Du borde har en computern eller du borde ha ingång till en computern på din lokal bibliotek eller college eller universitet , sedan dess den här vanligtvis har bättre förbindelserna till Internet. Du kanna också vanligtvis grunda din äga personlig FRI elektronisk sända med posten redovisa vid går till [mail.yahoo.com](mailto:mail.yahoo.com)

### Behaga ta en stund till finna den elektronisk sända med posten adress lokaliserat nederst eller slutet av den här sida. Vi hoppas du vill sända elektronisk sända med posten till oss , om den här er av hjälp eller uppmuntran. Vi också uppmuntra du till komma i kontakt med oss angående Elektronisk Bokna så pass vi erbjudande så pass de/vi/du/ni är utan kostnad , och fri.

\_\_\_\_\_

**Destament** gollunguud fel e allur et ddysg huchweneg

a achlesech 'u chan 'r 'n Ysbrydol Grymoedd ai arall  
rhwystrau a could amhara 'u ai arafa 'u i lawr.  
Blesio chyfnertha 'm pryd Arfera hon 'n Grai Destament at  
hefyd dybied chan 'r boblogi a wedi gwneud hon argraffiad  
ar gael , fel a Alla gweddïo am 'u a fel allan arhosa at  
chyfnertha hychwaneg boblogi Archa a anrhegech 'm  
anwylaeth chan 'ch 'n gysegr-lân Eiria ( 'r 'n Grai Destament  
) , a a anrhegech 'm 'n ysbrydol callineb a ddirnadaeth at  
adnabod gwellhawch a at ddeall 'r atalnod chan amsera a jm  
yn bucheddu i mewn. Blesio chyfnertha 'm at adnabod fel at  
ymdrin 'r afrwyddinebau a Dwi wynebedig ag ddiwedydd.  
Arglwydd Celi , Chyfnertha 'm at angen at adnabod  
gwellhawch a at angen at chyfnertha arall Cristnogion i  
mewn 'm arwynebedd a am 'r byd. Archa a anrhegech 'r  
Electronic llyfr heigia a hynny a gweithia acha 'r website a  
hynny a chyfnertha 'u 'ch callineb. Archa a chyfnerthech 'r  
hunigol aelodau chan 'n hwy deulu ( a 'm deulu ) at mo bod  
'n ysbrydol dwylledig , namyn at ddeall 'ch a at angen at  
chymer a canlyn 'ch i mewn 'n bob ffordd. a Archa 'ch at  
gwna hyn bethau i mewn 'r enwa chan Iesu , Amen ,

## Iceland – Icelandic

Prayer Isceland Icelandic Jesus Kristur Baen til Guo  
Hvernig til Bioja Hvernig geta spyrja gefa hjalpa andlegur  
Leiosogn

=====

Tal til Guð the Skapari af the Alheimur the Herra :

1. Þessi þú vildi gefa til mig the hugrekki til biðja the hlutur þessi ÉG þörf til biðja
2. Þessi þú vildi gefa til mig the hugrekki til trúa þú og þiggja hvaða þú vilja til komast af með minn líf , í staðinn af mig upphefja minn eiga vilja ( ásetningur ) yfir þinn.
3. Þessi þú vildi gefa mig hjálpa til ekki láta minn ógurlegur af the óþekktur til verða the afsökun , eða the undirstaða fyrir mig ekki til bera fram you. 4. Þessi þú vildi gefa mig hjálpa til sjá og til læra hvernig til hafa the andlegur styrkur ÉG þörf ( í gegnum þinn orð the Biblía a ) fyrir the atburður á undan ) og b ) fyrir minn eiga persónulegur andlegur ferð.
5. Þessi þú Guð vildi gefa mig hjálpa til vilja til bera fram Þú fleiri 6. Þessi þú vildi minna á mig til tala með þú prayerwhen ) ÉG er svekktur eða í vandi , í staðinn af erfiður til ásetningur hlutur ég sjálfur eini í gegnum minn mannlegur styrkur.
7. Þessi þú vildi gefa mig Viska og a hjarta fiskflak með Biblíulegur Viska svo þessi ÉG vildi bera fram þú fleiri á áhrifaríkan hátt.
8. Þessi þú vildi gefa mig a löngun til nema þinn orð the Biblía the Nýja testamentið Guðspjall af Klósett ) , á a persónulegur undirstaða
9. Þessi þú vildi gefa aðstoð til mig svo þessi ÉG er fær til taka eftir hlutur í the Biblía ( þinn orð ) hver ÉG geta persónulega segja frá til , og þessi vilja hjálpa mig skilja hvaða þú vilja mig til gera út af við minn líf.



10. Þessi þú vildi gefa mig mikill skarpskyggni , til skilja hvernig til útskýra til annar hver þú ert , og þessi ÉG vildi vera fær til læra hvernig til læra og vita hvernig til standa með þú og þinn orð the Biblía )

11. Þessi þú vildi koma með fólk ( eða websites ) í minn líf hver vilja til vita þú , og hver ert sterkur í þeirra nákvæmur skilningur af þú ( guð ); og Þessi þú vildi koma með fólk ( eða websites ) í minn líf hver vilja vera fær til hvetja mig til nákvæmur læra hvernig til deila the Biblía the orð guðs sannleikur (2 Hræðslugjarn 215:).

12. Þessi þú vildi hjálpa mig til læra til hafa mikill skilningur óður í hver Biblía útgáfa er bestur , hver er nákvæmur , og hver hefur the andlegur styrkur & máttur , og hver útgáfa samþykkja með the frumeintak handrit þessi þú blása í brjóst the ritstörf af the Nýja testamentið til skrifa.

13. Þessi þú vildi gefa hjálpa til mig til nota minn tími í góð kaup vegur , og ekki til sóa minn tími á Falskur eða tómur aðferð til fá loka til Guð ( en þessi ert ekki hreinskilnislega Biblíulegur ), og hvar þessir aðferð ávextir og grænmeti neitun langur orð eða varanlegur andlegur ávöxtur.

14. Þessi þú vildi gefa aðstoð til mig til skilja hvaða til leita að í a kirkja eða a staður af dýrkun , hvaða góður af spurning til spyrja , og þessi þú vildi hjálpa mig til finna trúmaður eða a prestur með mikill andlegur viska í staðinn af þægilegur eða falskur svar.

15. þessi þú vildi orsök mig til muna til leggja á minnið þinn orð the Biblía ( svo sem eins og Latneskt letur 8), svo þessi ÉG geta hafa það í minn hjarta og hafa minn hugur tilbúinn , og vera tilbúinn til gefa óákveðinn greinir í ensku svar til annar af the von þessi ÉG hafa óður í þú.

16. Þessi þú vildi koma með hjálpa til mig svo þessi minn eiga guðfræði og kenning til vera í samræmi við þinn orð the Biblía og þessi þú vildi halda áfram til hjálpa mig vita hvernig minn skilningur af kenning geta vera bæta svo þessi minn eiga líf lifestyle og skilningur halda áfram til vera loka til hvaða þú vilja það til vera fyrir mig.

17. Þessi þú vildi opinn minn andlegur innsýn ( endir ) fleiri og fleiri , og þessi hvar minn skilningur eða skynjun af þú er ekki nákvæmur , þessi þú vildi hjálpa mig til læra hver Jesús Kristur hreinskilnislega er.

18. Þessi þú vildi gefa hjálpa til mig svo þessi ÉG vildi vera fær til aðskilinn allir falskur helgisiðir hver ÉG hafa ósjálfstæði á , frá þinn bjartur kennsla í the Biblía , ef allir af hvaða ÉG er hópur stuðningsmanna er ekki af Guð , eða er gegn hvaða þú vilja til kenna okkur óður í hópur stuðningsmanna þú.

19. Þessi allir herafli af vondur vildi ekki taka burt allir andlegur skilningur hver ÉG hafa , en fremur þessi ÉG vildi halda the vitneskja af hvernig til vita þú og ekki til vera blekkja í þessir sem minnir á gömlu dagana) af andlegur blekking.

20. Þessi þú vildi koma með andlegur styrkur og hjálpa til mig svo þessi ÉG vilja ekki til vera hluti af the Mikill Bylta Burt eða af allir hreyfing hver vildi vera andlegur fölsun til þú og til þinn Heilagur Orð

21. Þessi ef there er nokkuð þessi ÉG hafa búinn minn líf , eða allir vegur þessi ÉG hafa ekki sá sem svarar til þú eins og ÉG öxl hafa og þessi er sem koma má í veg fyrir eða afstýra mig frá annar hvor gangandi með þú , eða having skilningur , þessi þú vildi koma með þessir hlutur / svar /

atburður bak inn í minn hugur , svo þessi ÉG vildi afneita þá í the Nafn af Jesús Kristur , og ekki minna en þeirra áhrif og afleiðing , og þessi þú vildi skipta um allir tótleiki ,sadness eða örvænting í minn líf með the Gleði af the Herra , og þessi ÉG vildi vera fleiri brennidepill á lærdómur til fylgja þú við lestur þinn orð the Biblía

22. Þessi þú vildi opinn minn auglýsing svo þessi ÉG vildi vera fær til greinilega sjá og þekkjanlegur ef there er a Mikill Blekking óður í Andlegur atriði , hvernig til skilja this q ( eða þessir atburður ) frá a Biblíulegur yfirsýn , og þessi þú vildi gefa mig viska til vita og svo þessi ÉG vilja læra hvernig til hjálpa minn vinátta og ást sjálfur ( ættingi ) ekki vera hluti af it.

**23.** Þessi þú vildi tryggja þessi einu sinni minn auglýsing ert opnari og minn hugur skilja the andlegur merking af straumur atburður hrífandi staður í the veröld , þessi þú vildi undirbúa minn hjarta til þiggja þinn sannleikur , og þessi þú vildi hjálpa mig skilja hvernig til finna hugrekki og styrkur í gegnum þinn Heilagur Orð the Biblía. Í the nafn af Jesús Kristur , ÉG spyrja fyrir þessir hlutur staðfesta minn löngun til vera í samkomulag þinn vilja , og ÉG er asking fyrir þinn viska og til hafa a ást af the Sannleikur Móttækilegur

=====

Fleiri á the Botn af Blaðsíða  
Hvernig til hafa Eilífur Líf

=====

Við ert glaður ef this listi ( af bæn beiðni til Guð ) er fær til aðstoða þú. Við skilja this mega ekki vera the bestur eða árangursríkur þýðing. Við skilja þessi there ert margir ólíkur lífnaðarhættir af tjáning hugsun og orð. Ef þú hafa a uppástunga fyrir a betri þýðing , eða ef þú vildi eins og til

taka a lítill magn af þinn tími til senda uppástunga til okkur , þú vilja vera skammtur þúsund af annar fólk einnig , hver vilja þá lesa the bæta þýðing.

Við oft hafa a Nýja testamentið laus í þinn tungumál eða í tungumál þessi ert sjaldgæfur eða gamall. Ef þú ert útlit fyrir a Nýja testamentið í a sérstakur tungumál , þóknast skrifa til okkur. Einnig , við vilja til vera viss og reyna til miðla þessi stundum , við gera tilboð bók þessi ert ekki Frjáls og þessi gera kostnaður peningar. En ef þú geta ekki hafa efni á sumir af þessir raftæknilegur bók , við geta oft gera óákveðinn greinir í ensku skipti af raftæknilegur bók fyrir hjálpa með þýðing eða þýðing vinna. Þú gera ekki verða að vera a faglegur verkamaður , eini a venjulegur manneskja hver er áhugasamur í skammtur. Þú öxl hafa a tölva eða þú öxl hafa aðgangur til a tölva á þinn heimamaður bókasafn eða háskóli eða háskóli , síðan þessir venjulega hafa betri tengsl til the. Þú geta einnig venjulega stofnsetja þinn eiga persónulegur FRJÁLS raftæknilegur póstur reikningur við að fara til mail.yahoo.com

Þóknast taka a augnablik til finna the raftæknilegur póstur heimilisfang staðgreina á the botn eða the endir af this blaðsíða. Við von þú vilja senda raftæknilegur póstur til okkur , ef this er af hjálpa eða hvatning. Við einnig hvetja þú til snerting okkur viðvirkjandi Raftæknilegur Bók þessi við tilboð þessi ert án kostnaður , og frjáls.

Við gera hafa margir bók í erlendum tungumál , en við gera ekki alltaf staður þá til taka á móti electronically ( sækja skrá af fjarlægri tölvu ) því við eini gera laus the bók eða the atriði þessi ert the beiðni. Við hvetja þú til halda áfram til biðja til Guð og til halda áfram til læra óður í Hann við

lestur the Nýja testamentið. Við velkominn þinn spurning og athugasemd við raftæknilegur póstur.

[illegible]

## *Danish* - Danemark

## Danish - Prayer Requests (praying / Talking) to God - explained in Danish Language

Prayer Danish Dannish Denmark Jesus Bon hen til God Hvor Bed  
kunne hore mig Hvor opfordre indromme haelp hen mig

Taler hen til God , den Skaberen i den Alt , den Lord : 1. at  
jer ville indrømme hen til mig den mod hen til bed den sager  
at JEG sayn hen til bed

2. at jer ville indrømme hen til mig den mod hen til tro jer og optage hvad jer ville gerne lave hos mig liv , istedet for mig ophøje mig besidde vil ( hensigt ) ovenfor jeres.

3. at jer ville indrømme mig hjælp hen til ikke lade mig skræk i den ubekendt hen til blive den bede om tilgivelse , eller den holdepunkt nemlig mig ikke hen til anrette you.

4. at jer ville indrømme mig hjælp hen til se efter og hen til lære hvor hen til nyde den appel kræfter JEG savn ( igennem jeres ord den Bibel ) en ) nemlig den begivenheder foran og b ) nemlig mig besidde personlig appel rejse.

5. At jer God ville indrømme mig hjælp hen til ville gerne anrette Jer flere

6. At jer ville erindre mig hen til samtale hos jer prayerwhen ) Jeg er kuldkastet eller i problem , istedet for prøver hen til løse sager selv bare igennem mig human kræfter.

7. At jer ville indrømme mig Klogskab og en hjerte fyldte hos Bibelsk Klogskab i den grad at JEG ville anrette jer flere effektive.

8. At jer ville indrømme mig en lyst hen til læse jeres ord , den Bibel , ( den Ny Testamente Gospel i John ), oven på en personlig holdepunkt

9. at jer ville indrømme hjælp hen til mig i den grad at Jeg er købedygtig mærke sager i den Bibel ( jeres ord ) hvilke JEG kunne jeg for mit vedkommende henhøre til , og at vil hjælp mig opfatte hvad jer savn mig hen til lave i mig liv.

10. At jer ville indrømme mig stor discernment , hen til opfatte hvor hen til forklare hen til andre hvem du er , og at JEG ville være i stand til lære hvor hen til lære og kende hvor hen til rage op nemlig jer og jeres ord ( den Bibel )

11. At jer ville overbringe folk ( eller websites ) i mig liv hvem ville gerne kende jer , og hvem er kraftig i deres nøjagtig opfattelse i jer God ); og At jer ville overbringe folk ( eller websites ) i mig liv hvem vil være i stand til give mod mig hen til akkurat lære hvor hen til skille den Bibel den ord i sandhed Timothy 215:).

12. At jer ville hjælp mig hen til lære hen til nyde stor opfattelse hvorom Bibel gengivelse er bedst , hvilke er højst nøjagtig , og hvilke har den højst appel kræfter & kraft , og hvilke gengivelse indvilliger hos den selvstændig håndskreven at jer inspireret den forfatteres i den Ny Testamente hen til skriv.

13. At jer ville indrømme hjælp hen til mig hen til hjælp mig gang i en artig måde , og ikke hen til affald mig gang oven på Falsk eller indholdsløs metoder hen til komme nærmere hen til God ( men at er ikke sandelig Bibelsk ), og der hvor dem metoder opføre for ikke så længe siden periode eller varer appel fruit.

14. At jer ville indrømme hjælp hen til mig hen til opfatte hvad hen til kigge efter i en kirke eller en opstille i andagtsøgende , hvad arter i spørgsmål hen til opfordre , og at jer ville hjælp mig hen til hitte tro eller en sidst hos stor appel klogskab istedet for nemme eller falsk svar.

15. at jer ville hidføre mig hen til huske hen til lære udenad jeres ord den Bibel ( såsom Romersk 8), i den grad at JEG kunne nyde sig i mig hjerte og nyde mig indre forberedt , og være rede til at indrømme en besvare hen til andre i den håbe på at Jeg har omkring jer.

16. At jer ville overbringe hjælp hen til mig i den grad at mig besidde theology og doctrines hen til samtykke med jeres ord , den Bibel og at jer ville fortsætte hen til hjælp mig kende hvor mig opfattelse i doctrine kan forbedret i den grad at mig besidde liv lifestyle og opfattelse fortsætter at blive nøjere hvortil jer savn sig at blive nemlig mig.

17. At jer ville lukke op mig appel indblik ( afslutninger ) flere og flere , og at der hvor mig opfattelse eller opfattelsesevne i jer er ikke nøjagtig , at jer ville hjælp mig hen til lære hvem Jesus Christ sandelig er.

18. At jer ville indrømme hjælp hen til mig i den grad at JEG ville være i stand til selvstændig hvilken som helst falsk rituals hvilke Jeg har afhænge oven på , af jeres slette lærer i den Bibel , eventuel hvoraf Jeg er næste er ikke i God

, eller er imod hvad jer ville gerne belære os omkring næste jer.

19. At hvilken som helst tvinger i dårlig ville ikke holde bortrejst hvilken som helst appel opfattelse hvilke Jeg har , men nærmest at JEG ville beholde den kundskab i hvor hen til kende jer og ikke at blive narrede i i denne tid i appel bedrag.

20. At jer ville overbringe appel kræfter og hjælp hen til mig i den grad at Ja ikke at blive noget af den Stor Nedadgående Bortrejst eller i hvilken som helst bevægelse som kunne være spiritually counterfeit hen til jer og hen til jeres Hellig Ord

21. At selv om der er alt at Jeg har skakmat mig liv , eller hvilken som helst måde at Jeg har ikke reageret hen til jer nemlig JEG burde nyde og det vil sige afholder mig af enten den ene eller den anden af omvandrende hos jer , eller har opfattelse , at jer ville overbringe dem sager / svar / begivenheder igen i mig indre , i den grad at JEG ville afstå fra sig i den Benævne i Jesus Christ , og al i deres effekter og følger , og at jer ville skifte ud hvilken som helst tomhed ,sadness eller opgive håbet i mig liv hos den Glæde i den Lord , og at JEG ville være flere indstille oven på indlæring hen til komme efter jer af læsning jeres ord , den Bibel

22. At jer ville lukke op mig øjne i den grad at JEG ville være i stand til klart se efter og anerkende selv om der er en Stor Bedrag omkring Appel emner , hvor hen til opfatte indeværende phenomenon ( eller disse begivenheder ) af en Bibelsk perspektiv , og at jer ville indrømme mig klogskab hen til kende hvorfor at Ja lære hvor hen til hjælp mig bekendte og elske ones ( slægtninge ) ikke være noget af it.



23. At jer ville sikre sig at når først mig øjne er anlagde og mig indre forstår den appel vægt i indeværende begivenheder indtagelse opstille på jorden , at jer ville lægge til rette mig hjerte hen til optage jeres sandhed , og at jer ville hjælp mig opfatte hvor hen til hitte mod og kræfter igennem jeres Hellig Ord , den Bibel. I den benævne i Jesus Christ , JEG anmode om disse sager bekræftende mig lyst at blive overensstemmende jeres vil , og Jeg er bede om nemlig jeres klogskab og hen til nyde en kærlighed til den Sandhed Amen

=====

Flere forneden Side

Hvor hen til nyde Evig Liv

=====

Vi er glad selv om indeværende liste over ( bøn anmoder hen til God ) er kan hen til hjælpe jer. Vi opfatte indeværende må ikke være den bedst eller højst effektiv gengivelse. Vi er klar over, at der er mange anderledes veje i gengivelse indfald og ord. Selv om du har en henstilling nemlig en bedre gengivelse , eller selv om jer ville gerne hen til holde en ringe beløb i jeres gang hen til sende antydninger hen til os , jer vil være hjælp tusindvis i andre ligeledes , hvem vil så er der ikke mere læse den forbedret gengivelse.

Vi ofte nyde en Ny Testamente anvendelig i jeres sprog eller i sprogene at er sjælden eller forhenværende. Selv om du er ser ud nemlig en Ny Testamente i en specifik sprog , behage henvende sig til os. Ligeledes , vi ville gerne være sikker og prøve hen til overfører at engang imellem , vi lave pristilbud bøger at er ufri og at lave omkostninger penge. Men selv om jer kan ikke afgive noget af dem elektronisk bøger , vi kunne ofte lave en udveksle i elektronisk bøger nemlig

hjælp hos gengivelse eller gengivelse arbejde. Jer som ikke har at blive en professional arbejder , kun få sand pågældende hvem er interesseret i hjælp.

Jer burde nyde en computer eller jer burde have adgang til en computer henne ved jeres lokal bibliotek eller kollegium eller universitet , siden dem til hverdag nyde bedre slægtskaber hen til den indre. Jer kunne ligeledes til hverdag indrette jeres besidde personlig **OMKOSTNINGSFRIT** elektronisk indlevere beretning af igangværende hen til [mail.yahoo.com](mailto:mail.yahoo.com)

###

Behage holde for et øjeblik siden hen til hitte den elektronisk indlevere henvende placeret nederst eller den enden på legen indeværende side. Vi håb jer vil sende elektronisk indlevere hen til os , selv om indeværende er i hjælp eller ophjælpning. Vi ligeledes give mod jer hen til henvende sig til os med henblik på Elektronisk Bøger at vi pristilbud at er uden omkostninger , og omkostningsfrit.

Vi lave nyde mange bøger i udenlandsk sprogene , men vi lave ikke altid opstille sig hen til byde velkommen elektronisk ( dataoverføre ) fordi vi bare skabe anvendelig den bøger eller den emner at er den højst anmodede.

Vi give mod jer hen til fortsætte hen til bed hen til God og hen til fortsætte hen til lære omkring Sig af læsning den Ny Testamente. Vi velkommen jeres spørgsmål og bemærkninger af elektronisk indlevere.

[illegible]

# Norway - Norway – Norwegian -

## Norway - Prayer Requests (praying ) to God - explained in Norwegian Language

Norway Norwegian Nordic Prayer Jesus Christ a God Hvor Be kanne hore meg bonn anmode gir hjelpe meg finner sprit Som kan ledes

=====

Snakker å God , skaperen av det Univers , det Lord :

1. det du ville gir å meg tapperheten å be tingene det JEG nød å be
2. det du ville gir å meg tapperheten å mene du og godkjenne hva du vil gjerne gjøre med meg livet , istedet for meg opphøye meg egen ville ( hensikten ) over din.
3. det du ville gir meg hjelpe å ikke utleie meg rank av det ubekjent å bli det be om tilgivelse , eller grunnlaget for meg ikke for å anrette you.
4. det du ville gir meg hjelpe å se og å høre hvor å har den sprit styrke JEG nød ( igjennom din ord bibelen ) en ) for begivenhetene for ut og b ) for meg egen personlig sprit reise.
5. Det du God ville gir meg hjelpe å vil gjerne anrette Du flere
6. Det du ville minne meg å samtalen med du prayerwhen ) JEG er frustrert eller inne problemet , istedet for prøver å løse saker meg selv bare igjennom meg human styrke.

7. Det du ville gir meg Klokskap og en hjertet fylte med Bibelsk Klokskap i den grad at JEG ville anrette du flere effektivt.

8. Det du ville gir meg en ønske å studere din ord , bibelen , ( det Ny Testamentet Gospel av John ), opp på en personlig basis

9. det du ville gir assistanse å meg i den grad at JEG er kjøpedyktig legge merke til saker inne bibelen ( din ord ) hvilke JEG kanne personlig fortelle til , og det vill hjelpe meg oppfatte hva du ønske meg å gjøre inne meg livet.

10. Det du ville gir meg stor discernment , å oppfatte hvor å forklare å andre hvem du er , og det JEG ville være i stand til høre hvor å høre og vite hvor å stå opp for du og din ord ( bibelen )

11. Det du ville bringe folk ( eller websites ) inne meg livet hvem vil gjerne vite du , og hvem er kraftig inne deres akkurat forståelse av du God ); og Det du ville bringe folk ( eller websites ) inne meg livet hvem ville være i stand til oppmuntre meg å akkurat høre hvor å dividere bibelen ordet av sannhet (Timothy 215:).

12. Det du ville hjelpe meg å høre å ha stor forståelse om hvilken Bibel versjon er best , hvilke er høyst akkurat , og hvilke har de fleste sprit styrke & makt , og hvilke versjon avtaler med det original manuskriptet det du inspirert forfatterne av det Ny Testamentet å skrive.

13. Det du ville gir hjelpe å meg å bruk meg tid inne en fint vei , og ikke for å sløseri meg tid opp på False eller tom emballasje metoder å komme nærmere å God ( bortsett fra

det er ikke virkelig Bibelsk ), og der hvor dem metoder tilvirke for ikke så lenge siden frist eller varer sprit fruit.

14. Det du ville gir assistanse å meg å oppfatte hva å kikke etter inne en kirken eller en sted av -tilbeder , hva arter av spørsmål å anmode , og det du ville hjelpe meg å finner mene eller en fortid med stor sprit klokskap istedet for lett eller false svar.

15. det du ville anledning meg å erindre å huske din ord bibelen ( som Romersk 8), i den grad at JEG kanne ha den inne meg hjertet og ha meg sinn ferdig , og være rede til å gir en svaret å andre av det håpe på at JEG ha om du.

16. Det du ville bringe hjelpe å meg i den grad at meg egen theology og doctrines å være enig i din ord , bibelen og det du ville fortsette å hjelpe meg vite hvor meg forståelse av doctrine kan forbedret i den grad at meg egen livet lifestyle og forståelse fortsetter å bli nøyere hvorfor du ønske den å bli for meg.

17. Det du ville åpen meg sprit innblikk ( konklusjonene ) flere og flere , og det der hvor meg forståelse eller oppfattelse av du er ikke akkurat , det du ville hjelpe meg å høre hvem Jesus Christ virkelig er.

18. Det du ville gir hjelpe å meg i den grad at JEG ville være i stand til separat alle false rituals hvilke JEG ha avhenge opp på , fra din helt lærer inne bibelen , eventuell av hva JEG følger er ikke av God , eller er i motsetning til hva du vil gjerne lære oss om fulgte du.

19. Det alle presser av dårlig ville ikke ta fjerne alle sprit forståelse hvilke JEG ha , bortsett fra temmelig det JEG ville selge i detalj kjennskapen til hvor å vite du og ikke for å være narret inne i disse dager av sprit bedrag.

20. Det du ville bringe sprit styrke og hjelpe å meg i den grad at Jeg vil ikke for å være del av det Stor Faller Fjerne eller av alle bevegelse hvilket kunne være spiritually counterfeit å du og å din Hellig Ord

21. Det hvis det er alt det JEG ha gjort det meg livet , eller alle vei det JEG ha ikke reagert å du idet JEG burde ha og det er forhindrer meg fra enten den ene eller den andre av gåing med du , eller har forståelse , det du ville bringe dem saker / svar / begivenheter rygg i meg sinn , i den grad at JEG ville renonsere på seg inne navnet av Jesus Christ , og alle av deres virkninger og konsekvensene , og det du ville ombytte alle tomhet ,sadness eller gi opp håpet inne meg livet med det Glede av det Lord , og det JEG ville være flere fokusere opp på innlæring å følge etter etter du av lesing din ord , det Bibel

22. Det du ville åpen meg eyes i den grad at JEG ville være i stand til klare se og anerkjenne hvis det er en Stor Bedrag om Sprit emner , hvor å oppfatte denne phenomenon ( eller disse begivenheter ) fra en Bibelsk perspektiv , og det du ville gir meg klokskap å vite hvorfor det Jeg vil høre hvor å hjelpe meg venner og elsket seg ( slektningene ) ikke være del av it.

23. Det du ville sikre det en gang meg eyes er åpen og meg sinn forstår det sprit vekt av aktuelle begivenheter tar sted på jorden , det du ville forberede meg hjertet å godkjenne din sannhet , og det du ville hjelpe meg oppfatte hvor å finner tapperheten og styrke igjennom din Hellig Ord , bibelen. Inne navnet av Jesus Christ , JEG anmode om disse saker bekreftende meg ønske å bli i følge avtalen din ville , og JEG spør til deres klokskap og å har en kjærlighet til det Sannhet Samarbeidsvillig

=====

Flere på bunnen av Side  
Hvor å ha Evig Livet

=====

Vi er glad hvis denne liste over ( bønn anmoder å God ) er dugelig å hjelpe du. Vi oppfatte denne kanskje ikke være det best eller høyst effektiv oversettelse. Vi forstå det der er mange annerledes veier av gjengivelsen innfall og ord. Hvis du har en forslag for en bedre oversettelse , eller hvis du ville like å ta en liten beløpet av din tid å sende antydninger å oss , du ville være hjalp tusenvis av andre mennesker likeledes , hvem ville så lese det forbedret oversettelse. Vi ofte har en Ny Testamentet anvendelig inne din omgangsspråk eller inne språkene det er sjelden eller gamle. Hvis du er ser for en Ny Testamentet inne en spesifikk omgangsspråk , behage skrive til oss. Likeledes , vi vil gjerne være sikker og prøve å meddele det en gang imellom , vi gjøre tilbud bøker det er ufri og det gjøre bekostning pengene.

Bortsett fra hvis du kan ikke by noen av dem elektronisk bøker , vi kanne ofte gjøre en bytte av elektronisk bøker for hjelpe med oversettelse eller oversettelse arbeide. Du som ikke har å bli en profesjonell arbeider , kun få stamgjest personen hvem er interessert i hjalp. Du burde har en computer eller du burde ha adgang til en computer for din innenbys bibliotek eller universitet eller universitet , siden dem vanligvis ha bedre forbindelser å det sykehuslege. Du kanne likeledes vanligvis opprette din egen personlig LEDIG elektronisk innlevere regningen av går å [mail.yahoo.com](mailto:mail.yahoo.com)

Behage ta en øyeblikk å finner det elektronisk innlevere henvende seg lokalisert nederst eller utgangen av denne side. Vi håpe du ville sende elektronisk innlevere å oss ,





εργασία ότι τους θέλετε για να κάνετε. Παρακαλώ βοηθήστε κάθε έναν από τους για να μην έχετε το φόβο και για να θυμηθείτε ότι είστε ο Θεός που απαντά στην προσευχή και που είναι υπεύθυνος για όλα.

Προσεύχομαι ότι θα τους ενθαρρύνετε, και ότι τους προστατεύετε, και η εργασία & το υπουργείο ότι συμμετέχουν.

Προσεύχομαι ότι θα τους προστατεύετε από τις πνευματικές δυνάμεις ή άλλα εμπόδια που θα μπορούσαν να τους βλάψουν ή να τους επιβραδύνουν. Παρακαλώ με βοηθήστε όταν χρησιμοποιώ αυτήν την νέα διαθήκη για να σκεφτώ επίσης τους ανθρώπους που έχουν καταστήσει αυτήν την έκδοση διαθέσιμη, έτσι ώστε μπορώ να προσεηθώ για τους και έτσι μπορούν να συνεχίσουν να βοηθούν περισσότερους ανθρώπους.

Προσεύχομαι ότι θα μου δίνετε μια αγάπη του ιερού Word σας (η νέα διαθήκη), και ότι θα μου δίνετε την πνευματικές φρόνηση και τη διάκριση για να σας ξέρετε καλύτερα και για να καταλάβετε τη χρονική περίοδο ότι ζούμε μέσα.

Παρακαλώ με βοηθήστε για να ξέρετε πώς να εξετάσει τις δυσκολίες ότι έρχομαι αντιμέτωπος με κάθε ημέρα. Ο Λόρδος God, με βοηθά για να θελήσει να σας ξέρει καλύτερα και να θελήσει να βοηθήσει άλλους Χριστιανούς στην περιοχή μου και σε όλο τον κόσμο.

Προσεύχομαι ότι θα δίνετε την ηλεκτρονική ομάδα βιβλίων και εκείνοι που τους βοηθούν η φρόνησή σας. Προσεύχομαι ότι θα βοηθούσατε τα μεμονωμένα μέλη της οικογένειάς τους (και της οικογένειάς μου) για να εξαπατηθείτε όχι πνευματικά, αλλά για να σας καταλάβετε και για να θελήσετε να σας δεχτείτε και να ακολουθήσετε με κάθε τρόπο. Επίσης παρέχετε μας την άνεση και οδηγίες σε αυτούς τους χρόνους και σας ζητώ για να κάνω αυτά τα πράγματα στο όνομα του Ιησού, Amen,



6. Daß Sie mich erinnern würden, mit Ihnen zu sprechen (prayer)when mich werden frustriert oder in der Schwierigkeit, anstatt zu versuchen, Sachen selbst nur durch meine menschliche Stärke zu beheben.

7. Daß Sie mir Klugheit und ein Herz geben würden, füllten mit biblischer Klugheit, damit ich Sie effektiv dienen würde.

8. Daß Sie mir einen Wunsch geben würden, Ihr Wort, die Bibel zu studieren, (das neues Testament-Evangelium von John) auf persönlicher Ebene

9. das Sie Unterstützung zu mir geben würden, damit ich bin, Sachen in der Bibel (Ihr Wort) zu beachten der ich auf und der persönlich beziehen kann mir hilft, zu verstehen, was Sie mich in meinem Leben tun wünschen.

10. Daß Sie mir große Einsicht geben würden, um zu verstehen wie man anderen erklärt, die Sie sind, und daß ich sein würde, zu erlernen, wie man erlernt und kann für Sie und Ihr Wort (die Bibel) oben stehen

11. Daß Sie Leute (oder Web site) in meinem Leben holen würden, die Sie kennen möchten und die in ihrem genauen Verständnis von Ihnen stark sind (Gott); und das würden Sie Leute (oder Web site) in meinem Leben holen, das ist, mich anzuregen, genau zu erlernen, wie man die Bibel das Wort der Wahrheit (2 Timothee 2:15) teilt.

12. Daß Sie mir helfen würden zu erlernen, großes Verständnis über, welche Bibelversion zu haben am besten ist, die am genauesten ist und die die geistigste Stärke u. die Energie hat und dem Version mit den ursprünglichen Manuskripten übereinstimmt, daß Sie die Autoren des neuen Testaments anspornten zu schreiben.

13. Daß Sie mir Hilfe, um meine Zeit in einer guten Weise zu verwenden geben würden, und meine Zeit auf den falschen oder leeren Methoden nicht zu vergeuden, näher an Gott (aber dem, zu erhalten nicht wirklich biblisch seien Sie) und wo jene Methoden keine lange Bezeichnung oder dauerhafte geistige Frucht produzieren.

14. Daß Sie mir Unterstützung geben würden, was zu verstehen, in einer Kirche oder in einem Ort der Anbetung zu suchen, welche Arten der Fragen zum zu bitten und daß Sie mir helfen würden, Gläubiger oder einen Pastor mit großer geistiger Klugheit anstelle von den einfachen oder falschen Antworten zu finden.

15. den Sie mich veranlassen würden, mich zu erinnern, um sich Ihr Wort zu merken die Bibel (wie Romans ist 8), damit ich es in meinem Herzen haben und an meinen Verstand sich vorbereiten lassen kann, und bereit, eine Antwort zu anderen der Hoffnung zu geben, die ich über Sie habe.

16. Daß Sie mir Hilfe damit meine eigene Theologie und Lehren holen würden, um mit Ihrem Wort, die Bibel übereinzustimmen und daß Sie fortfahren würden, mir zu helfen, zu können, mein Verständnis der Lehre verbessert werden kann, damit mein eigenes Leben, Lebensstil und Verstehen fortfährt, zu sein näher an, was Sie es für mich sein wünschen.

17. Daß Sie meinen geistigen Einblick (Zusammenfassungen) mehr und mehr öffnen würden und daß, wo mein Verständnis oder Vorstellung von Ihnen nicht genau ist, daß Sie mir helfen würden, zu erlernen, wem Jesus Christ wirklich ist.

18. Daß Sie mir Hilfe geben würden, damit ich in der Lage SEIN würde, alle falschen Rituale zu trennen, denen ich von, von Ihrem freien Unterricht in der Bibel, wenn irgendwelche abgehangen habe von, was ich folgend bin, ist nicht vom Gott, oder ist konträr zu, was Sie uns unterrichten wünschen - über das Folgen Sie.

19. Daß keine Kräfte des Übels nicht irgendwie geistiges Verständnis wegnehmen würden, das ich habe, aber eher, daß ich das Wissen behalten würde von, wie man Sie kennt und nicht an diesen Tagen der geistigen Täuschung betrogen wird.

20. Daß Sie geistige Stärke holen und zu mir helfen würden, damit ich nicht ein Teil von großen weg fallen oder irgendeiner Bewegung bin, die zu Ihnen und zu Ihrem heiligen Wort Angelegenheiten nachgemacht sein würde.

21. Das, wenn es alles gibt, das ich in meinem Leben getan habe oder irgendeine Weise, daß ich nicht auf Sie reagiert habe, wie ich haben sollte und die mich entweder am Gehen mit Ihnen hindert oder Haben des Verstehens, daß Sie jene things/responses/events zurück in meinen Verstand, damit ich auf sie im Namen Jesus Christ verzichten würde, und alle ihre von und von Konsequenzen holen würden und daß Sie jede mögliche Leere, Traurigkeit oder Verzweiflung in meinem Leben mit der Freude am Lord ersetzen würden und daß ich mehr auf das Lernen, Ihnen zu folgen gerichtet würde, indem man Ihr Wort las, die Bibel.

22. Daß Sie meine Augen öffnen würden, damit ich in der Lage SEIN würde, offenbar zu sehen und zu erkennen, wenn es eine große Täuschung über geistige Themen gibt, wie man dieses Phänomen (oder diese Fälle) von einer biblischen Perspektive und daß Sie mir Klugheit geben würden, um zu wissen und damit ich erlernt versteht, wie

man meinen Freunden und liebte eine (Verwandte) ein Teil von ihm nicht zu sein hilft.

23 Daß Sie sicherstellen würden, daß einmal meine Augen und mein Verstand geöffnet sind, versteht die geistige Bedeutung der gegenwärtigen Fälle, die in der Welt stattfinden, daß Sie mein Herz vorbereiten würden, um Ihre Wahrheit anzunehmen und daß Sie mir helfen würden, zu verstehen, wie man Mut und Stärke durch Ihr heiliges Wort, die Bibel findet. Im Namen Jesus Christ, bitte ich um diese Sachen, die meinen Wunsch bestätigen, Ihr Wille übereinzustimmen, und ich bitte um Ihre Klugheit und eine Liebe der Wahrheit zu haben, Amen.

=====

Mehr an der Unterseite der Seite  
wie man ewiges Leben u.  
Hat

=====

Wir sind froh, wenn diese Liste (der Gebetanträge zum Gott) in der Lage ist, Sie zu unterstützen. Wir verstehen, daß diese möglicherweise nicht die beste oder wirkungsvollste Übersetzung sein kann. Wir verstehen, daß es viele unterschiedliche Weisen des Ausdrückens von von Gedanken und von von Wörtern gibt. Wenn Sie einen Vorschlag für eine bessere Übersetzung haben oder wenn Sie etwas Ihrer Zeit dauern möchten, Vorschläge zu schicken uns, werden Sie Tausenden der Leute auch helfen, die dann die verbesserte Übersetzung lesen. Wir haben häufig ein neues Testament, das in Ihrer Sprache oder in den Sprachen vorhanden ist, die selten oder alt sind.

Wenn Sie nach einem neuen Testament in einer spezifischen Sprache suchen, schreiben Sie uns bitte. Auch wir möchten sicher sein und versuchen, das manchmal mitzuteilen, bieten wir Bücher an, die nicht frei sind und die Geld kosten. Aber, wenn Sie nicht einige jener elektronischen Bücher sich leisten können, können wir einen Austausch der elektronischen Bücher für Hilfe bei der Übersetzung oder bei der Übersetzung Arbeit häufig tun. Sie müssen nicht ein professioneller Arbeiter sein, nur eine regelmäßige Person, die interessiert ist, an zu helfen.

Sie sollten einen Computer haben, oder Sie sollten Zugang zu einem Computer an Ihrer lokalen Bibliothek oder Hochschule oder Universität haben, da die normalerweise bessere Anschlüsse zum Internet haben. Sie können Ihr eigenes persönliches FREIES Konto der elektronischen Post, indem Sie zum [mail.yahoo.com](mailto:mail.yahoo.com)

auch normalerweise herstellen gehen dauern bitte einen Moment, um die Adresse der elektronischen Post zu finden befunden an der Unterseite oder am Ende dieser Seite. Wir hoffen, daß Sie uns elektronische Post schicken, wenn diese hilfreich oder Ermutigung ist. Wir regen Sie auch an, mit uns hinsichtlich der elektronischen Bücher in Verbindung zu treten, die wir dem sind ohne Kosten und freies

anbieten, die, wir viele Bücher in den Fremdsprachen haben, aber wir nicht sie immer setzen, um elektronisch zu empfangen (Download) weil wir nur vorhanden die Bücher oder die Themen bilden, die erbeten sind. Wir regen Sie an fortzufahren, zum Gott zu beten und fortzufahren, über ihn zu erlernen, indem wir das neue Testament lesen. Wir

begrüßen Ihre Fragen und Anmerkungen durch elektronische Post.

[illegible]

Caro Deus , Obrigada que esta Novo Testamento tem sido lançado de modo a que nós somos capaz aprender mais sobre a ti. Por favor ajudar a gente responsável por fazendo esta Electrónico livro disponível.

Por favor ajudar eles estarem capaz de trabalho rapidamente , e fazer mais Electrónico livros disponível Por favor ajudar eles haverem todos os recursos , o dinheiro , a força e as horas que elas precisar a fim de ser capaz de guardar trabalhando para si.

Por favor ajudar aquelas esse are parte da equipa essa ajuda lhes num todos os dias base. Por favor dar lhes a força continuar e dar cada deles o espiritual compreendendo para o trabalho que você quer eles fazerem. Por favor ajudar cada um deles para não ter medo e lembrar que tu és o deus o qual respostas oração e quem é encarregado de todas as coisas.

EU orar que a ti would encorajar lhes , e que você protege  
lhes , e o trabalho & ministério que elas são comprometido  
em. EU orar que você protegeria lhes de o Espiritual Forças  
ou outro barreiras isso poderia ser malefício lhes ou lento  
lhes abaixo.

Por favor ajudar a mim quando Eu uso esta Novo  
Testamento para também reflectir a gente o qual ter feito  
esta edição disponível , de modo a que eu possa orar para  
eles e por conseguinte eles podem continuar ajudar mais



peessoas EU orar que você daria a mim um amar do seu Divino Palavra ( o novo Testamento ), e que você daria a mim espiritual sabedoria e discernment conhecer a ti melhor e para compreender o período de tempo que nós somos vivendo em.

Por favor ajudar eu saber como lidar com as dificuldades que Eu sou confrontado com todos os dias. Lorde Deus , Ajudar eu querer conhecer a ti Melhor e querer ajudar outro Christian no meu área e pelo mundo. EU orar que você daria o Electrónico livro equipa e aquelas o qual trabalho no Websters e aqueles que ajudar lhes seu sabedoria. EU orar que você ajudaria o indivíduo membros do seu família ( e a minha família ) para não ser espiritual enganar , mas compreender a ti e querer aceitar e seguir a ti em todos bastante. e Eu pergunto você fazer estas coisas em nome de Jesus , Amen ,

=====

Dear God,

Thank you that this New Testament has been released so that we are able to learn more about you.

Please help the people responsible for making this Electronic book available. Please help them to be able to work fast, and make more Electronic books available Please help them to have all the resources, the money, the strength and the time that they need in order to be able to keep working for You.

Please help those that are part of the team that help them on an everyday basis. Please give them the strength to continue and give each of them the spiritual understanding for the work that you want them to do. Please help each of them to not have fear and to remember that you are the God who

answers prayer and who is in charge of everything.

I pray that you would encourage them, and that you protect them, and the work & ministry that they are engaged in.

I pray that you would protect them from the Spiritual Forces or other obstacles that could harm them or slow them down.

Please help me when I use this New Testament to also think of the people who have made this edition available, so that I can pray for them and so they can continue to help more people

I pray that you would give me a love of your Holy Word (the New Testament), and that you would give me spiritual wisdom and discernment to know you better and to understand the period of time that we are living in.

Please help me to know how to deal with the difficulties that I am confronted with every day. Lord God, Help me to want to know you Better and to want to help other Christians in my area and around the world.

I pray that you would give the Electronic book team and those who work on the website and those who help them your wisdom.

I pray that you would help the individual members of their family (and my family) to not be spiritually deceived, but to understand you and to want to accept and follow you in every way.

and I ask you to do these things in the name of Jesus,  
Amen,

=====

[illegible]

## Croatian - Prayer Requests (praying ) to God - explained in Croatian Language

**Govorenje to Bog , Stvoritelj dana Svemir , Gospodar :**

1. taj te će popuštanje meni u hrabrost to moliti predmet taj  
Trebam to moliti
2. taj te će popuštanje meni u hrabrost to vjerovati te i  
prihvatiti što koji želite za napraviti sa mojim život ,  
umjesto mene uznijeti moj posjedovati htijenje ( namjera )  
iznad tvoj.
3. taj te će popuštanje mene ponuditi ne pustiti moj  
strahovanje dana nepoznat postati isprika , ili baza za mene  
ne to poslužitelj you.
4. taj te će popuštanje mene ponuditi vidjeti i naučiti kako to  
imati duhovni snaga Trebam ( preko tvoj riječ Biblija ) za  
jedan dan događaj ispred i b ) za moj posjedovati osobni  
duhovni putovanje.

5. Taj te Bog će popuštanje mene ponuditi ištanje to poslužitelj Te više

6. Taj te će podsjetiti mene to pričati sa te prayerwhen ) Ja sam frustriran ili u problemima , umjesto težak to odluka predmet ja osobno jedini preko moj čovječji snaga.

7. Taj te će popuštanje mene Mudrost i srce ispunjen sa Biblijski Mudrost tako da JA će poslužitelj te više efektivno.

8. Taj te će popuštanje mene želja to studirati tvoj riječ , Biblija , ( novim Oporuka Evanđelje od John ), na osobni baza

9. taj te će popuštanje pomoć meni u tako da Ja sam u mogućnosti to obavijest predmet in Biblija ( tvoj riječ ) što Ja mogu osobni povezivati se , i da htijenje pomoć mene shvatiti što koji želite mene za napraviti u mojem život.

10. Taj te će popuštanje mene velik raspoznavanje , to shvatiti kako to objasniti to ostali tko ti si , i da JA bi bilo u mogućnosti naučiti kako naučiti i znati kako to pristajati uza što te i tvoj riječ ( Biblija )

11. Taj te će donijeti narod ( ili websiteovi ) u mojem život tko ištanje to znati te , i tko jesu jak in njihov točnost sporazum od te ( bog ); i da te će donijeti narod ( ili websiteovi ) u mojem život koji će biti u mogućnosti to hrabriti mene to precizan naučite kako podijeliti Biblija riječ od istina (2 Plašljiv 215:).

12. Taj te će pomoć mene naučiti to imati velik sporazum o što Biblija inačici je najbolji , što je većina točnost , i što je preko duhovni snaga & Power PC , i što inačici sporazum sa izvorni rukopis taj te nadahnut autorstvo dana Nov Oporuka to pisati.

13. Taj te će popuštanje ponuditi mene korištenje moj vrijeme in dobar put , i ne to prosipati moj vrijeme na Neistinit ili prazan Metodije da biste dobili Zatvori to Bog ( ali koji nisu vjerno Biblijski ), i gdje svi oni Metodije stvarajući nijedan čeznuti uvjeti ili trajan duhovni voće.

14. Taj te će popuštanje pomoć meni u to shvatiti što učiniti tražiti in Churchill ili mjesto od moliti se , što rod od pitanje to pitati , i da te će pomoć mene pronaći onaj koji vjeruje ili pastor sa velik duhovni mudrost umjesto lahak ili neistinit odgovoriti.

15. taj te će nanijeti mene to sjećati se to sjećati se tvoj riječ Biblija ( kao što je Rumunjski 8), tako da Ja mogu imati Internet u mojem srce i imati moj imati što protiv spreman , i biti spreman to popuštanje odgovoriti to ostali dana uzdanica taj Imam o te.

16. Taj te će donijeti ponuditi mene tako da moj posjedovati teologija i doktrina to poklapati se tvoj riječ , Biblija i da te će nastaviti to pomoć mene znati kako moj sporazum od doktrina može poboljšati tako da moj posjedovati život , stil života i sporazum nastaviti biti Zatvori to što koji želite Internet biti za mene.

17. Taj te će OpenBSD moj duhovni unutar ( zaključak ) više i više , i da gdje svi moj sporazum ili percepcija od te nije točnost , taj te će pomoć mene naučiti tko Isus Krist vjerno je.

18. Taj te će popuštanje ponuditi mene tako da JA bi bilo u mogućnosti to odijeljen bilo koji neistinit ritualni što Imam zavisnost na , from tvoj jasan pomoć u učenju in Biblija , ako postoje od što Ja sam sljedeće nije od Bog , ili je ugovor to što koji želite to vas naučiti nas o sljedeće te.

19. Taj bilo koji sila od zlo će ne oduteti bilo koji duhovni sporazum što Imam , ali radije taj JA će čvrsto držati znanje kako to znati te i ne biti lukav in te dani od duhovni varka.

20. Taj te će donijeti duhovni snaga i ponuditi mene tako da JA neće biti dio ognjevit Jesen Daleko ili od bilo koji pokret što bi bilo produhovljeno krivotvoren novac vama i u vaš Svet Riječ

21. Da ako ima je išta taj Imam ispunjavanja u mojem život , ili bilo koji put taj Imam ne odgovaranje vama kao JA trebaju imati i da je koji se može spriječiti mene sa ili hodanje sa te , ili vlasništvo sporazum , taj te će donijeti oni predmet / reakcija / događaj leđa u moj imati što protiv , tako da JA će odreći se njima in ime od Isus Krist , i svi od njihov efekt i posljedica , i da te će opet staviti bilo koji praznina ,sadness ili izgubiti nadu u mojem život sa Ono što pruža užitak dana Gospodar , i da JA bi bilo više fokusirati na znanje to udarac te mimo čitanje tvoj riječ , Biblija

22. Taj te će OpenBSD moj oči tako da JA bi bilo u mogućnosti to jasno vidjeti i prepoznati ako ima Velik Varka o Duhovni tema , kako to shvatiti ovaj fenomen ( ili te događaj ) from Biblijski perspektiva , i da te će popuštanje mene mudrost to znati i tako dalje taj JA htijenje naučite kako pomoć moj prijatelj i voljen sam sebe ( odnosni ) ne biti dio it.

23. Taj te će osigurati da jedanput moj oči jesu OpenBSD i moj imati što protiv shvatiti duhovni izražajnost od tekući događaj uzimanje mjesto u svijetu , taj te će pripremiti moj srce to prihvatiti tvoj istina , i da te će pomoć mene shvatiti kako pronaći hrabrost i snaga preko tvoj Svet Riječ , Biblija. In ime od Isus Krist , JA tražiti te predmet potvrditi moj

želja biti složno tvoj htijenje , i Ja sam iskanje tvoj mudrost i  
to imati hatar dana Istina Da

=====

Više podno Stranica  
Kako to imati Vječan Život

=====

Mi jesu veseo ako ovaj rub ( od moljenje molba to Bog ) je  
u mogućnosti to pomoći te. Mi shvatiti ovaj možda neće biti  
najbolji ili većina djelotvoran prevođenje. Mi shvatiti koji su  
mnogobrojan različit putevi od istiskivanje misao i riječ.  
Ukoliko imati sugestija za bolji prevođenje , ili ukoliko će  
voljeti uzeti malolitražan iznos od tvoj vrijeme to poslati  
sugestija nama , te htijenje biti pomoć tisuća od ostali narod  
isto tako , koji će onda čitanje oplemenjen prevođenje. Mi  
više puta imati Nov Oporuka raspoloživ u vaš jezik ili in  
jezik koji su rijedak ili star. Ako ste obličje za Nov Oporuka  
in specifičan jezik , ugoditi korespondirati nas. Isto tako , mi  
ižtanje istinabog i pokušati komunicirati taj katkada , mi  
obaviti ponuda knjiga koji nisu Slobodan i da obaviti trošak  
novac.

Ali ukoliko ne moći priuštiti neki od oni elektronski knjiga ,  
mi može više puta obaviti izmjena od elektronski knjiga za  
pomoć sa prevođenje ili prevođenje funkcionirati. Nemate  
biti koji se odnosi na zvanje radnik , samo jedan dan  
pravilan osoba tko je zainteresirana za pomoć. Te trebaju  
imati računalo ili te trebaju imati pristup to računalo at tvoj  
lokalni knjižnica ili fakulteti ili sveučilišta , otada oni obično  
imati bolji povezivanje to Internet. Možete isto tako obično  
utemeljiti tvoj posjedovati osobni SLOBODAN elektronička  
pošta račun odlaskom na mail.yahoo.com

Ugoditi uzeti tren pronaći elektronička pošta adresa smjestiti na dnu ili kraj od ovaj stranica. Nadamo se te htijenje poslati elektronička pošta nama , ako ovaj je od pomoć ili hrabrenje. Mi isto tako hrabriti te to kontakt nas zabrinutost Elektronski Knjiga koju nudimo koji su sa trošak , i slobodan.

Mi obaviti imati mnogobrojan knjiga in stran jezik , ali mi ne uvijek mjesto njima to primiti elektronski ( preuzimanje datoteka ) jer mi jedini izraditi raspoloživ knjiga ili tema koji su preko molba. Mi hrabriti te to nastaviti to moliti to Bog i to nastaviti naučiti o Njemu mimo čitanje novim Oporuka. Mi dobrodošli na tvoj pitanje i komentirajte mimo elektronička pošta.

[illegible]

CZECH CZECH TCHEK

Czech Prayer Modlitba Kristian jezuita Kristus az k Buh Jak  
Modlit Buh pocinovat slyset modlitba k ptat Buh darovat  
pomoci mne

## Czech - Prayer Requests (praying / Talking) to God - explained in Czech Language

Mluvení až k Bůh , člen určitý Stvořitel of člen určitý  
Soubor , člen určitý Hospodin :

1. aby tebe chtěl bych darovat až k mne člen určitý kuráž až k modlit člen určitý majetek aby Nemusím až k modlit  
2. aby tebe chtěl bych darovat až k mne člen určitý kuráž až k domnívat se tebe a přijmout jaký tebe potřeba až k jednat má duch , místo mne povýšit já sám vůle ( cíl ) nad tvůj.



3. aby tebe chtěl bych darovat mne pomoci až k ne dovolit má být se of člen určitý neznámá až k stát se člen určitý odpustit , či člen určitý báze do mne rozcházet se v názorech sloužit you.

4. aby tebe chtěl bych darovat mne pomoci až k vidět a až k dostat instrukce jak? až k mít člen určitý duchovní síla Nemusím ( docela tvůj slovo člen určitý Bible ) jeden ) do člen určitý příhoda vpřed a b ) do já sám osobní duchovní cesta.

5. Aby tebe Bůh chtěl bych darovat mne pomoci až k potřeba až k sloužit Tebe více 6. Aby tebe chtěl bych připomenout komu mne až k rozmlouvat s tebe prayerwhen ) JÁ am zmařený či do nesnáz , místo trying až k analyzovat majetek já sám ale docela má lidský síla.

7. Aby tebe chtěl bych darovat mne Moudrost a jeden srdce náky s Biblický Moudrost tak, že JÁ chtěl bych sloužit tebe více efektivní. 8. Aby tebe chtěl bych darovat mne jeden poručit až k učení tvůj slovo , člen určitý Bible , ( Nový zákon Evangelium of Jan ), dále jeden osobní báze

9. aby tebe chtěl bych darovat pomoc až k mne tak, že JÁ am schopný až k oznámení majetek do člen určitý Bible ( tvůj slovo ) kdo Dovedu co se mě týče být v poměru k sem tam , to postačí pomoci mne dovídat se jaký tebe potřeba mne až k zavraždit má duch.

10. Aby tebe chtěl bych darovat mne celek bystrost , až k dovídat se jak? až k jasně se vyjádřit až k jiní kdo tebe ar , a aby JÁ chtěl bych být schopný až k dostat instrukce jak? až k dostat instrukce a vŘdŘt jak? až k postavit se za tebe a tvůj slovo ( člen určitý Bible )

11. Aby tebe chtěl bych nést lid ( či websites ) do má duch kdo potřeba až k vŘdŘt tebe , a kdo ar silný do jejich přesný dohoda of tebe ( bůh ); a Aby tebe chtěl bych nést lid ( či websites ) do má duch kdo vůle být schopný až k dodat myslí mne až k přesný dostat instrukce jak? až k dělit člen určitý Bible Písmo svaté pravda (2 Bázlivý 215:).

12. Aby tebe chtěl bych pomoci mne až k dostat instrukce až k mít celek dohoda kolem kdo Bible líčení is nejlépe , kdo is nejčtetnější přesný , a kdo 3sg.préz.od have člen určitý nejčtetnější duchovní síla & množství , a kdo líčení souhlasí jít s duchem času originál rukopis aby tebe dýchat člen určitý spisovatele of Nový zákon až k psát.

13. Aby tebe chtěl bych darovat pomoci až k mne až k cvičení má čas do jeden blaho cesta , a rozcházet se v názorech zpustošit má čas dále Chybný či hladový metody až k brát blízký až k Bůh ( kdyby ne ar ne opravdu Biblický ), a kde those metody napsat ne dlouhá hláska čas či {lasting||stálý||trvalý}} duchovní nést ovoce.

14. Aby tebe chtěl bych darovat pomoc až k mne až k dovídat se jaký až k hledat do jeden církev či jeden bydliště of uctívání , jaký rody of otázky až k ptát se , a aby tebe chtěl bych pomoci mne až k nález věřící či jeden duchovní s celek duchovní moudrost místo bezstarostný či chybný odpovídá.

15. aby tebe chtěl bych být příčinou mne na pamětnou až k memorovat tvůj slovo člen určitý Bible ( jako takový Říman 8), tak, že Dovedu mít ono do má srdce a mít má mysl připravený , a být hbitý až k darovat neurč. člen být v souhlase s jiní of člen určitý naděje aby Mám u sebe tebe.

16. Aby tebe chtěl bych nést pomoci až k mne tak, že já sám bohosloví a doktrína až k souhlasit s tvůj slovo , člen určitý

Bible a aby tebe chtěl bych stále být pomoci mne vŘdŘt jak? má dohoda of doktrína pocínovat být opravit tak, že já sám duch lifestyle a dohoda odročit až k být blízký k jakému účelu tebe potřeba ono až k být pro mne.

17. Aby tebe chtěl bych nechráněný má duchovní jasnozření ( konec ) čím dále, tím více , a aby kde má dohoda či chápavost of tebe is ne přesný , aby tebe chtěl bych pomoci mne až k dostat instrukce kdo Jezuita Kristus opravdu is.

18. Aby tebe chtěl bych darovat pomoci až k mne tak, že JÁ chtěl bych být schopný až k oddělený jakýkoliv chybný obřad kdo JÁ mít důvěra dále , dle tvůj celý doktrína do člen určitý Bible , jestli vůbec of jaký JÁ am následující is ne of Bůh , či is proti čemu jaký tebe potřeba až k učit us kolem následující tebe.

19. Aby jakýkoliv dohnat of neštěstí chtěl bych ne odebrat jakýkoliv duchovní dohoda kdo JÁ mít , aby ne dosti aby JÁ chtěl bych držet člen určitý znalost čeho jak? až k vŘdŘt tebe a rozcházet se v názorech být klamat do tezaury days of duchovní klam.

20. Aby tebe chtěl bych nést duchovní síla a pomoci až k mne tak, že JÁ vůle rozcházet se v názorech být část of notáblové Klesání Pryč či of jakýkoliv pohyb kdo chtěl bych být duchovo falšovat až k tebe a až k tvůj Svatý Slovo

21. Aby -li tam is cokoli aby JÁ mít utahaný má duch , či jakkoli aby JÁ mít ne dotazovaná osoba až k tebe ačkoliv Šel bych mít a to jest opatření mne dle jeden nebo druhý kráčení s tebe , či having dohoda , aby tebe chtěl bych nést those majetek / citlivost přístroje / příhoda bek do má mysl , tak, že JÁ chtěl bych nectít barvu je jménem koho Jezuita Kristus , a celek of jejich dojem a dosah , a aby tebe chtěl bych dát na dřívější místo jakýkoliv emptiness ,sadness či

beznadějnost do má duch jít s duchem času Radost of člen určitý Hospodin , a aby J chtěl bych být více ložisko dále učenost až k doprovázet tebe do četba tvůj slovo , Bible

22. Aby tebe chtěl bych nechráněný probůh tak, že JÁ chtěl bych být schopný až k jasně vidět a pochopit -li tam is jeden Celek Klam kolem Duchovní námět , jak? až k dovídat se tato přechodný ( či tezaury příhoda ) dle jeden Biblický perspektiva , a aby tebe chtěl bych darovat mne moudrost až k vřdřt a tak, že JÁ vůle dostat instrukce jak? posloužit jídlem má druh a Amor sám ( příbuzní ) ne být část of it.

23. Aby tebe chtěl bych pojistit aby druhdy probůh ar nechráněný a má mysl dovídat se člen určitý duchovní význam of běh příhoda dobytí bydliště do člen určitý svět , aby tebe chtěl bych chystat se má srdce až k přijmout tvůj pravda , a aby tebe chtěl bych pomoci mne dovídat se jak? až k nález kuráž a síla docela tvůj Svatý Slovo , člen určitý Bible. Jménem koho Jezuita Kristus , JÁ tázat se na tezaury majetek biřmovat má poručit až k být doma souhlas tvůj vůle , a JÁ am ptaní se do tvůj moudrost a až k mít jeden láska ke komu člen určitý Pravda Amen

=====

Více v člen určitý Dno of Blok  
Jak? až k mít Nekonečný Duch

=====

My ar rád -li tato barevný pruh of modlitba dotaz až k Bůh is schopný až k pomáhat tebe. My dovídat se tato moci ne být člen určitý nejlépe či nejčtetnější efektivní dešifrování. My dovídat se tamhleten ar mnoho neobvyklý cesty of interpretace domněnky a slova. -li tebe mít jeden návrh do jeden lépe dešifrování , či -li tebe chtěl bych do téže míry až

k brát jeden malý činit of tvůj čas až k poslat návrhy až k us , tebe vůle být porce jídla tisíc of druhý lid rovněž , kdo vůle někdy číst člen určitý opravit dešifrování. My často mít jeden Nový Poslední vůle přístupný do tvůj jazyk či do jazyk aby ar nedovařený či dávný. -li tebe ar hledět do jeden Nový Poslední vůle do jeden specifický jazyk , být příjemný psát až k us. Rovněž , my potřeba až k jisté a namáhat až k být ve styku aby někdy , my činit nabídka blok aby ar ne Drzý a aby činit cena peníze.

Aby ne -li tebe dělostřelectvo přítok nějaký of those elektronický blok , my pocínovat často činit neurč. člen burza of elektronický blok do pomoci s dešifrování či dešifrování práce. Tebe činit ne mít až k být jeden odborný dělník , ale jeden pořádný osoba kdo is obchod do porce jídla. Tebe požadovat mít jeden počítač či tebe požadovat mít přístup až k jeden počítač v tvůj lokálka knihovna či akademie či univerzita , od té doby those obvyklý mít lépe klientela až k člen určitý internovaná osoba. Tebe pocínovat rovněž obvyklý upevnit tvůj drahý osobní DRZÝ elektronická pošta účet do existující až k mail.yahoo.com

Být příjemný brát jeden důležitost až k nález člen určitý elektronická pošta adresovat nalézt v člen určitý dno či člen určitý cíl of tato blok. My naděje tebe vůle poslat elektronická pošta až k us , -li tato is of pomoci či podpora. My rovněž dodat myslí tebe až k dotyk us pokud jde o Elektronický Blok aby my nabídka aby ar bez cena , a drzý.

My činit mít mnoho blok do cizí jazyk , aby ne my činit někdy bydliště je až k dostat electronically ( zavádění ) poněvadž my ale dělat přístupný člen určitý blok či člen určitý námět aby ar člen určitý nejčtenější dotaz. My dodat myslí tebe až k stále být modlit až k Bůh a až k stále být

dostat instrukce kolem Jemu do četba Nový zákon. My vítat  
tvůj otázky a poznámky do elektronická pošta.

[illegible]

## Drogi Bóg , Dziękuję ów ten Nowy Testament

ma być zwolniony byle tylko jesteśmy able wobec nauczyć się liczniejszy około ty. Proszę mi pomóc ludzie odpowiedzialny pod kątem wykonaniem ten Elektroniczny książka rozporządzalny.

Proszę mi pomóc im zostać wypłacalny praca umocowany ,  
i zrobić liczniejszy Elektroniczny książki rozporządzalny  
Proszę mi pomóc im wobec mieć wszystko ten zasoby , ten  
pieniądze , ten siła i ten czas ów oni potrzebować w klasa  
zostać wypłacalny utrzymywać działanie pod kątem Ty.  
Proszę mi pomóc ów ów jesteście obowiązek od ten drużyna  
ów współpracownik im u an codzienny podstawa.

Podobać się dawać im ten siła wobec kontynuować i dawać  
każdy od im ten duchowy zgoda pod kątem ten praca ów ty  
potrzeba im wobec czynić. Proszę mi pomóc każdy od im  
wobec nie mieć strach i wobec zapamiętać ów jesteś ten  
Bóg który odpowiedzi modlitwa i który jest w koszt od  
wszystko. JA błagać ów ty byłby zachęcać im , i ów ty  
ochraniać im , i ten praca & ministerstwo ów oni są zajęty.  
JA błagać ów ty byłby ochraniać im z ten Duchowy Siły  
zbrojne albo inny przeszkody ów kulisy szkoda im albo  
powolny im w dół. Proszę mi pomóc podczas JA używać  
ten Nowy Testament wobec także pomyśleć od ludzie który  
mieć wykonane ten wydanie rozporządzalny , byle tylko JA

puszka metalowa modlić się za im i tak oni puszka  
metalowa robić w dalszym ciągu współpracownik

licniejszy społeczeństwo JA błagać ów ty byłby dawać mi  
 pewien miłość od twój Świąty Wyraz ( ten Nowy Testament  
 ), i ów ty byłby dawać mi duchowy mądrość i orientacja  
 wobec znać ty polepszyć i wobec rozumieć ten okres ów  
 jesteśmy żyjący w. Proszę mi pomóc wobec znać jak wobec  
 zawierać z transakcją ten trudności ów JA jestem  
 skonfrontowany rezygnować codziennie.

Lord Bóg , Współpracownik mi wobec potrzeba wobec znać  
ty Polepszyć i wobec potrzeba wobec współpracownik inny  
Chrześcijanin w mój powierzchnia i wokoło ten świat.  
JA błagać ów ty byłby dawać ten Elektroniczny książka  
drużyna i ów który praca od pajęczyny i ów który  
współpracownik im twój mądrość. JA błagać ów ty byłby  
współpracownik ten indywidualny członki od ich rodzina ( i  
mój rodzina ) wobec nie być duchowo zwodził , oprócz  
wobec rozumieć ty i ja wobec potrzeba wobec uznawać i  
następować po ty w na wszelki sposób. i JA zapytać ty  
wobec czynić tych rzeczy na Boga Jezus , Amen ,

=====

[illegible]

## Slovenian - Prayer Requests (praying / Talking) to God - explained in Slovenian Language

slovenian prayer jezuit Kristus molitev Bog kako prositi kako moci  
slisati svoj zaprositi podati ponuditi komu kaj mi

=====

pri aparatu imeti se za boga , tvorec od vseмирje , bog :

1. to vi hoteti izročiti mi pogum prositi stvari to rabim  
prositi
2. to vi hoteti izročiti mi pogum v vernik vi ter uvaževati  
kakšen hočeš vzdržati svoj življenje , namesto mi  
navdušenje svoj lasten hoteti ( namen ) zgoraj vaš.
3. to vi hoteti izročiti mi ponuditi komu kaj ne pustiti svoj  
grozen od neznan v postati opravičilo , ali osnova navzlic  
ne streči you.
4. to vi hoteti izročiti mi ponuditi komu kaj zagledati ter  
zvedeti kako imeti božji zakon čvrstost rabim ( skozi vaš  
izraziti z besedami biblija ) a ) zakaj pripetljaj spredaj ter b )  
zakaj svoj lasten osebni netelesen potovanje.
5. to vi Bog hoteti izročiti mi ponuditi komu kaj biti brez  
streči vi več
6. to vi hoteti spomniti se mi pogovarjati se vi prayerwhen )  
jaz sem uničen ali v težava , namesto težaven odločiti stvari  
sebi šele skozi svoj človeški čvrstost.
7. to vi hoteti izročiti mi modrost ter a srčika poln Biblical  
modrost tako da jaz hoteti začetni udarec z žogo vi več  
razpoložljiv.



8. to vi hoteti izročiti mi a zahteva študirati vaš izraziti z besedami , biblija , ( novi testament evangelij od John ), naprej a osebno osnova

9. to vi hoteti izročiti pomoč mi tako da morem opaziti stvari v biblija ( vaš izraziti z besedami ) kateri morem osebno tikati se česa , ter to zadostuje pomoč mi razumeti kakšen vi biti brez mi uganjati v svoj življenje.

10. to vi hoteti izročiti mi velik bistroumnost , v razumeti kako razlagati drugim kdo vi ste , ter to jaz domišljavec zmožen zvedeti kako zvedeti ter znanje kako stati pokoncu zakaj vi ter vaš izraziti z besedami ( biblija )

11. to vi hoteti privleči narod ( ali websites ) v svoj življenje kdo biti brez znati vi , ter kdo ste krepek v svoj natančen razumeven od vi ( Bog ); ter to vi hoteti privleči narod ( ali websites ) v svoj življenje kdo hoteti obstati zmožen v podžigati mi v natančen zvedeti kako razpreti biblija izraziti z besedami od resnica (2 plašljiv 215:).

12. to vi hoteti pomoč mi zvedeti imeti velik razumeven približno kateri biblija prevod je najprimernejši , kateri je največ natančen , ter kateri has največ netelesen čvrstost & sila , ter kateri prevod strinjati se s samorasel rokopis to vi vdihniti pisec od novi testament pisati.

13. to vi hoteti izročiti ponuditi komu kaj mi rabiti svoj čas v a dober izuriti za hojo ali ježo po cesti , ter ne v razsipavati svoj čas naprej napačen ali puhel metoda zadobiti sklepnik v Bog ( če že ne ste ne resnično Biblical ), ter kraj oni metoda predelki ne dolg pogoj ali trajen netelesen sadje.

14. to vi hoteti izročiti pomoč mi v razumeti kakšen iskati v a cerkvica ali a mesto od častiti , kakšen milosten od vprašanje zaprositi , ter to vi hoteti pomoč mi najti vernik ali a pastor s velik netelesen modrost namesto neprisiljen ali napačen odgovor.

15. to vi hoteti vzrok mi spomniti se naučiti se na pamet vaš izraziti z besedami biblija ( kot na primer retoromanski 8), tako da morem življati to v svoj srčika ter življati svoj srce

pripravljen , ter obstati radovoljen podati odgovor drugim od upanje to imam približno vi.

16. to vi hoteti privleči ponuditi komu kaj mi tako da svoj lasten teologija ter nauk ujemati se s vaš izraziti z besedami , biblija ter to vi hoteti vzdržnost v pomoč mi znanje kako svoj razumeven od nauk moči obstati izpopolniti tako da svoj lasten življenje lifestyle ter razumeven vzdržnost to live at warefare with s.o. sklepnik eemu vi biti brez to v obstati navzlic.

17. to vi hoteti plan svoj netelesen vpogled ( sklep ) bolj in bolj , ter to kraj svoj razumeven ali zaznavanje od vi ni natančen , to vi hoteti pomoč mi zvedeti kdo jezuit Kristus resnično je.

18. to vi hoteti izročiti ponuditi komu kaj mi tako da jaz domišljavec zmožen razstati se poljuben napačen cerkveni obredi kateri imam odvisnost naprej , s vaš veder poučevanje v biblija , če sploh kateri od kakšen jaz sem sledeč ni od Bog , ali je nasprotno eemu kakšen hočeš učiti nas približno sledeč vi.

19. to poljuben vojna sila od zlo hoteti ne odvzeti poljuben netelesen razumeven kateri imam , šele precej to jaz hoteti obdržati znanost od kako znati vi ter ne v obstati goljufati dandanes od netelesen prevara.

20. to vi hoteti privleči netelesen čvrstost ter ponuditi komu kaj mi tako da nočem v obstati del od velika gospoda padanje stran ali od poljuben tok kateri domišljavec netelesen ponarejen vam na uslugo ter v vaš svet izraziti z besedami

21. to če je nič to imam velja v svoj življenje , ali vsekakor to imam ne odgovor vam na uslugo kot jaz should življati ter to je preprečljiv mi s vsak izmed obeh pešačenje z vami , ali imetje razumeven , to vi hoteti privleči oni stvari / odgovor / pripetljaj prislon v svoj srce , tako da jaz hoteti odreči se jih v imenu ljudstva, usmiljenja itd. jezuit Kristus , ter prav do svoj vrednostni papirji ter posledica , ter to vi hoteti nadomestiti poljuben puhlost ,sadness ali obup v svoj

življenje s veselje od bog , ter to jaz domišljavec več žarišče  
naprej učenje slediti vi z čitanje vaš izraziti z besedami ,  
biblija

22. to vi hoteti plan svoj oči tako da jaz domišljavec zmožen  
v jasno zagledati ter pred sodiščem se pismeno obvezati če  
je a velik prevara približno netelesen predmet , kako v  
razumeti to fenomen ( ali od this pripetljaj ) s a Biblical  
perspektiven , ter to vi hoteti izročiti mi modrost znati ter  
tako da bom se učil kako v pomoč svoj prijateljstvo ter  
ljubezen sam sebe, sebi, se ( žlahta ) ne obstati del od it.

23. to vi hoteti zavarovati to nekoč svoj oči ste odpirač ter  
svoj srce razumeti božji zakon pomen od tok pripetljaj  
taking mesto na svetu , to vi hoteti pripraviti se svoj srčika  
vzeti vaš resnica , ter to vi hoteti pomoč mi razumeti kako  
najti pogum ter čvrstost skozi vaš svet izraziti z besedami ,  
biblija. v imenu ljudstva, usmiljenja itd. jezuit Kristus , jaz  
prositi od this stvari potrditi svoj zahteva v biti znotraj  
pogodba vaš hoteti , ter vprašam zakaj vaš modrost ter imeti  
a ljubezen od resnica Amen.

=====

več pravzaprav od stran  
kako imeti več en življenje

=====

mi smo vesel če to zapisati v seznam ( od molitev prošnja v  
Bog ) je zmožen pomagati vi. mi razumeti to maj ne obstati  
najboljši ali največ uspešen prevod. mi razumeti to so veliko  
različen ways od iztisljiv mnenje ter izraziti z besedami. če  
vi življati a nasvet zakaj a rajši prevod , ali če vi hoteti vseh  
biti zavzeti a tesen znesek od vaš čas pošiljati nasvet v nas ,  
boš pomaganje tisoč od drugi narod tudi , kdo hoteti torej  
čitanje izpopolniti prevod. mi pogosto življati a nova zaveza

pri roki v vaš jezik ali v jezik to ste redek ali star. če iščeš a nova zaveza v a poseben jezik , prosim napisati rabiti. tudi , mi biti brez v obstati varen ter začeti v biti obhajan to včasih , mi delati oferirati knjiga to ste ne prost ter to delati strošek penez.

šele če vi ne morem privoščiti si nekaj tega oni elektronski knjiga , mi moči pogosto delati mena od elektronski knjiga zakaj pomoč s prevod ali prevod opus. vi nikar ne življati to live at warefare with s.o. a poklicen delavec , šele a reden oseba kdo je zavzet v pomaganje. vi should življati a računalo ali vi should življati postranski v a računalo v vaš tukajšnji knjižnica ali višja gimnazija ali univerza , odkar oni navadno življati rajši vez v stažist v bolnišnici. vi moči tudi navadno ustanoviti vaš lasten osebni prost elektronski verižna srajca račun z tekoč v mail.yahoo.com

prosim zalotiti a važnost za odkriti elektronski verižna srajca ogovor poiskati pravzaprav ali prenehati od to stran. mi upanje boš poslal elektronski verižna srajca v nas , če to je od pomoč ali encouragement. mi tudi podžigati vi v zveza nas zadeven elektronski knjiga to mi oferirati to ste če ne strošek , ter prost.

mi delati življati veliko knjiga v tuji jeziki , šele mi nikar ne zmeraj mesto jih sprejeti electronically ( travnato gričevje ) zato ker mi šele izdelovanje pri roki knjiga ali predmet to ste največ prošnja. mi podžigati vi v vzdržnost prositi v Bog ter v vzdržnost zvedeti približno njega z čitanje novi testament. mi izreči dobrodošlico vaš vprašanje ter razložiti z elektronski verižna srajca.

=====

**srčkan Bog , the same to to nova  
zaveza has been izpust** tako da mi smo

prosim pomoč jih premoči opus nagel , ter izdelovanje več elektronski knjiga pri roki prosim pomoč jih imeti vsi sredstvo , penez , čvrstost ter čas to oni potreba zato da obstati zmožen vzdrževati ki dela zakaj vi.

prosim pomoč oni to ste del od skupina to pomoč jih naprej vsakdanji osnova. prosim izročiti jih čvrstost v vzdržnost ter izročiti vsakteri od jih božji zakon razumeven zakaj opus to vi biti brez jih uganjati. prosim pomoč vsakteri od jih v ne življati strah ter spomniti se to vi ste Bog kdo odgovor molitev ter kdo je v ukaz od vse.

jaz predlagati da vi hoteti podžigati jih , ter to vi zavarovati jih , ter opus & ministrstvo to oni so zaposlen s čim. jaz predlagati da vi hoteti zavarovati jih s netelesen vojna sila ali drugi zapreka to strjena lava škoda jih ali počasi vozite jih niz. prosim pomoč mi čas jaz raba to nova zaveza v tudi pretehtati od preprosti ljudje kdo življati narejen to naklada pri roki ,

tako da morem prositi za jih ter tudi oni moči vzdržnost v pomoč več narod jaz predlagati da vi hoteti izročiti mi a ljubezen od vaš svet izraziti z besedami ( novi testament ), ter to vi hoteti izročiti mi netelesen modrost ter bistrournost

znati vi rajši ter v razumeti epoha od čas to mi smo življenje  
v.

prosim pomoč mi znati kako v obravnavati težek to jaz sem  
soočiti s vsak dan. lord Bog , pomoč mi hoteti znanje vi rajši  
ter hoteti pomoč drugi krščanski v svoj area ter po svetu.  
jaz predlagati da vi hoteti izročiti elektronski knjiga skupina  
ter oni kdo opus naprej tkalec ter oni kdo pomoč jih vaš  
modrost. jaz predlagati da vi hoteti pomoč poedinec  
članstvo od svoj rodbina ( ter svoj rodbina ) v ne obstati  
netelesen goljufati , šele v razumeti vi ter hoteti uvaževati  
ter slediti vi v sleherni izuriti za hojo ali ježo po cesti. ter jaz  
zapositi vi uganjati od this stvari v imenu ljudstva,  
usmiljenja itd. jezuit , Amen ,

[illegible]

**mahal diyos** , pasalamatn ka atipan ng pawid ito bago testamento may been pakawalan pagayon atipan ng pawid tayo ay able sa mag-aral laling marami buongpaligid ka. masiyahan tumulong ang mga tao may pananagutan dahil sa making ito Electronic book makukuha. masiyahan tumulong kanila sa maaari able sa gumawa ayuno , at gawin laling marami Electronic books makukuha masiyahan tumulong kanila sa may lahat ang mapamaraan , ang salapi , ang lakas at ang takdaan ng oras atipan ng pawid sila mangilangan di iutos sa maaari able sa tago gumawa dahil sa ka.

masiyahan tumulong those atipan ng pawid ay mahati ng ang itambal atipan ng pawid tumulong kanila sa isa pang-araw-araw batayan. masiyahan bigyan kanila ang lakas sa mapatuloy at bigyan bawa't isa ng kanila ang tangayin pang-unawa dahil sa ang gumawa atipan ng pawid ka magkulang

kanila sa gumawa. masiyahan tumulong bawa't isa ng kanila sa hindi may katakutan at sa gunitain atipan ng pawid ka ay ang diyos sino sumagot dasal at sino ay di pagbintangan ng lahat ng bagay.

ako magdasal atipan ng pawid ka would palakasin ang loob kanila , at atipan ng pawid ka ipagsanggalang kanila , at ang gumawa & magkalinga atipan ng pawid sila ay kumuha di. ako magdasal atipan ng pawid ka would ipagsanggalang kanila sa ang tangayin pilitin o iba sagwil atipan ng pawid could saktan kanila o slow kanila itumba.

masiyahan tumulong ako kailan ako gumamit ito bago testamento sa din isipin ng ang mga tao sino may made ito edisyon makukuha , pagayon atipan ng pawid ako maaari magdasal dahil sa kanila at pagayon sila maaari mapatuloy sa tumulong laling marami mga tao ako magdasal atipan ng pawid ka would bigyan ako a ibigin ng mo banal salita ( ang bago testamento ), at atipan ng pawid ka would bigyan ako tangayin dunong at discernment sa malaman ka lalong mapabuti at sa maintindihan ang tukdok ng takdaan ng oras atipan ng pawid tayo ay ikinabubuhay di.

masiyahan tumulong ako sa malaman paano sa makitungo kumuha ang mahirap hindi madali atipan ng pawid ako ay confronted kumuha bawa't araw. panginoon diyos , tumulong ako sa magkulang sa malaman ka lalong mapabuti at sa magkulang sa tumulong iba binyagan di akin malawak at sa tabi-tabi ang daigdig. ako magdasal atipan ng pawid ka would bigyan ang Electronic book itambal at those sino gumawa sa ang website at those sino tumulong kanila mo dunong.

ako magdasal atipan ng pawid ka would tumulong ang isang tao pagkakasapi ng kanila mag-anak ( at akin mag-anak ) sa hindi maaari spiritually dayain , datapuwa't sa maintindihan ka at sa magkulang sa tanggapin at sundan ka di bawa't daan. at ako humingi ka sa gumawa tesis bagay di ang pangalanan ng heswita , susugan ,

[illegible]

Haluta auttaa ihmiset edesvastuullinen ajaksi ansaitseva nyt kuluva Elektroninen kirjanpidollinen saatavana. Haluta auttaa heidät jotta olla etevä jotta aikaansaada paastota , ja ehtiä enemmän Elektroninen luettelossa saatavana Haluta auttaa heidät jotta hankkia aivan varat , raha , kesto ja aika että he kaivata kotona aste jotta olla etevä jotta elatus työskentely ajaksi Te.

Haluta auttaa joka -lta heidät jotta ei hankkia pelätä ja jotta muistaa että te aari Jumala joka tottelee nimeä hartaushetki ja joka on kotona hinta -lta kaikki. I-KIRJAIN pyytää hartaasti että te edistää heidät , ja että te suojata heidät , ja aikaansaada & ministerikausi että he aari varattu kotona. I-KIRJAIN pyytää hartaasti että te suojata heidät polveutua Henki- Joukko eli toinen este että haitta heidät eli hitaasti heidät heittää. Haluta auttaa we jahka I-KIRJAIN apu nyt kuluva Veres Jälkisäädös jotta kin ajatella -lta ihmiset joka hankkia kokoonpantu nyt kuluva painos saatavana , joten että I-KIRJAIN kanisteri pyytää hartaasti ajaksi heidät ja



joten he kanisteri jatkaa jotta auttaa enemmän ihmiset I-KIRJAIN pyytää hartaasti että te kimmoisuus we lempiä -lta sinun Pyhä Sana ( Veres Jälkisäädös ), ja että te kimmoisuus we henki- viisaus ja arvostelukyky jotta osata te vedonlyöjä ja jotta käsittää aika -lta aika että me aari asuen kotona. Haluta auttaa we jotta osata kuinka jotta antaa avulla hankala että I-KIRJAIN olen asettaa vastakkain avulla joka aika. Haltija Jumala , Auttaa we jotta haluta jotta osata te Vedonlyöjä ja jotta haluta jotta auttaa toinen Kristitty kotona minun kohta ja liepeillä maailma.

I-KIRJAIN pyytää hartaasti että te kimmoisuus Elektroninen kirjanpidollinen joukkue ja ne joka aikaansaada model after kudos ja ne joka auttaa heidät sinun viisauts. I-KIRJAIN pyytää hartaasti että te auttaa yksilö jäsenmäärä -lta heidän heimo ( ja minun heimo ) jotta ei olla henkisesti eksyttää , ainoastaan jotta käsittää te ja jotta haluta jotta hyväksyä ja harjoittaa te kotona joka elämäntapa. ja I-KIRJAIN anoa te jotta ajaa nämä tavarat kotona maine -lta Jeesus , Vastuunalainen ,

=====

[illegible]

**Raring Gud , Tack själv så pass den här Ny**  
Testamente er blitt befriaren så fakta ät vi er  
duglig till lära sig mer omkring du. Behag hjälpa mig  
folk ansvarig för tillverkningen den här Elektronisk bok  
tillgänglig.

Behag hjälpa mig dem till vara köpa duktig verk fort , och göra mer Elektronisk bokna tillgänglig Behag hjälpa mig dem till har alla resurserna , pengarna , den styrka och tiden så pass de behov for att kunde hålla arbetande till deras. Behag hjälpa mig den här så pass de/vi/du/ni är del om spannen så pass hjälp dem på en daglig basis. Behaga ger dem den styrka till fortsätta och ger var av dem den ande förståndet för den verk så pass du vilja dem till gör. Behag hjälpa mig var av dem till inte har rädsla och till minas så pass du er den Gud vem svar bön och vem er han i lidelse av allting.

JAG be så pass du skulle uppmuntra dem , och så pass du skydda dem , och den verk & ministären så pass de er förlovad i.

JAG be så pass du skulle skydda dem från den Ande Pressar eller annan hinder så pass kunde skada dem eller långsam dem ned. Behag hjälpa mig när JAG använda den här Ny Testamente till också tänka om folk vem har gjord den här upplagan tillgänglig , så fakta åt JAG kanna be för dem och så de kanna fortsätta till hjälp mer folk JAG be så pass du skulle ge mig en kärlek om din Helig Uttrycka ( den Ny Testamente ), och så pass du skulle ge mig ande visdom och discernment till veta du bättre och till förstå den period av tid så pass vi er levande i.

Behag hjälpa mig till veta hur till ha att göra med svårigheten så pass JAG er stillt överför var dag. Vår Herre och Frälsare Gud , Hjälpa mig till vilja till veta du Bättre och till vilja till hjälp annan Kristen i min areal och i omkrets det värld. JAG be så pass du skulle ger den Elektronisk bok slå sig ihop och den här vem arbeta på den spindelväv och den här vem hjälp dem din visdom.

JAG be så pass du skulle hjälp individuellt medlemmen av deras familj ( och min familj ) till inte bli spirituellt lurat , utom till förstå du och mig till vilja till accept och följa du i varje väg. och JAG fråga du till gör de här sakerna inne om namn av Jesus , Samarbetsvillig ,

[illegible]

**Allerkærest God , Tak for lån at indeværende Ny Testamente** er blevet løst i den grad at vi er kan hen til lære flere omkring jer. Behage hjælp den folk ansvarlig nemlig gør indeværende Elektronisk skrift anvendelig. Behage hjælp sig at blive købedygtig arbejde holdbar , og skabe flere Elektronisk bøger anvendelig Behage hjælp sig hen til nyde en hel ressourcer , den penge , den kræfter og den gang at de savn for at være i stand til opbevare i orden nemlig Jer.

Behage hjælp dem at er noget af den hold at hjælp sig oven på en hverdags holdepunkt. Behage indrømme sig den kræfter hen til fortsætte og indrømme hver i sig den appel opfattelse nemlig den arbejde at jer savn sig hen til lave. Behage hjælp hver i sig hen til ikke nyde skræk og hen til huske at du er den God hvem svar bøn og hvem står for arrangementet i alt.

JEG bed at jer ville give mod sig , og at jer sikre sig , og den arbejde & ministerium at de er forlovet i. JEG bed at jer ville sikre sig af den Appel Tvinger eller anden hindring at kunne afbræk sig eller sen sig nede.

Behage hjælp mig hvor JEG hjælp indeværende Ny  
Testamente hen til ligeledes hitte på den folk hvem nyde  
skabt indeværende oplag anvendelig , i den grad at JEG  
kunne bed nemlig sig hvorfor de kunne fortsætte hen til  
hjælp flere folk JEG bed at jer ville indrømme mig en

kærlighed til jeres Hellig Ord ( den Ny Testamente ), og at  
 jer ville indrømme mig appel klogskab og discernment hen  
 til kende jer bedre og hen til opfatte den periode at vi er  
 nulevende i.

Behage hjælp mig hen til kende hvor hen til omhandle den problemer at Jeg er stillet over for hver dag. Lord God , Hjælp mig hen til ville gerne kende jer Bedre og hen til ville gerne hjælp anden Christians i mig område og omkring den jord.

JEG bed at jer ville indrømme den Elektronisk skrift hold og dem hvem arbejde med den website og dem hvem hjælp sig jeres klogskab. JEG bed at jer ville hjælp den individ medlemmer i deres slægt ( og mig slægt ) hen til ikke være spirituallly narrede , men hen til opfatte jer og hen til ville gerne optage og komme efter jer i al mulig måde. og JEG opfordre jer hen til lave disse sager i den benævne i Jesus , Amen ,

[illegible]

**Молитва к богу Дорогой Бог, Вы что были выпущены** это Gospel или этот новый testament так, что мы будем выучить больше о вас. Пожалуйста помогите людям ответственным для делать эту электронную книгу имеющейся. Вы знаете они и вы можете помочь им. Пожалуйста помогите им мочь работать быстро, и сделайте более электронные книги имеющейся Пожалуйста помогите им иметь все

ресурсы, деньг, прочность и время которые они для того чтобы мочь держать работать для вас. Пожалуйста помогите тем будут частью команды помогает им на ежедневное основание. Пожалуйста дайте им прочность для того чтобы продолжать и давать каждому из их духовное вникание для работы что вы хотите их сделать. Пожалуйста помогите каждому из их не иметь страх и не вспоминать что вы будете богом отвечают молитве и in charge of все. Я молю что вы ободрили их, и что вы защищаете их, и работа & министерство что они включены внутри.

Я молю что вы защитили их от духовных усилий или других препон смогли повредить им или замедлить им вниз. Пожалуйста помогите мне когда я использую этот новый testament также для того чтобы думать людей делали этот вариант имеющейся, так, что я смогу помолить для их и поэтому их сможете продолжать помочь больше людей.

Я молю что вы дали мне влюбленность вашего святейшего слова (Новый завет), и что вы дали мне духовные премудрость и распознание для того чтобы знать вас более лучше и понять период времени котором мы живем в. Пожалуйста помогите мне суметь как общаться с затруднениями что я confronted с каждым днем. Лорд Бог, помогает мне хотеть знать вас более лучше и хотеть помочь другим христианкам в моей области и вокруг мира.

Я молю что вы дали электронную команду и те книги помогают им ваша премудрость. Я молю что вы помогли индивидуальным членам их семьи (и моей семьи) духовност быть обманутым, но понять вас и хотеть принять и последовать за вас в каждой дороге. Также дайте нам комфорт и наведение в эти времена и я



определителен член работа & министерство този те сте задължавам in. АЗ моля този ти уж защитавам тях от определителен член Духовен Сила или друг пречка този p.t. от сап вреда тях или бавен тях голо възвишение. Харесвам помагам те кога АЗ употреба този Нов Завещание към също мисля на определителен член хора кой имам p.t. и p.p. от make този издание наличен , така този АЗ мога моля за тях и така те мога продължавам към помагам повече хора АЗ моля този ти уж давам те а любов на youг Свят Дума ( определителен член Нов Завещание ), и този ти уж давам те духовен мъдрост и различаване към зная ти по-добър и към разбирам определителен член период на време този ние сте жив in. Харесвам помагам те към зная как към раздавам с определителен член мъчен този АЗ съм изправлям пред с всеки ден.

Лорд Бог , Помагам те към липса към зная ти По-добър и към липса към помагам друг Християнски in ту площ и наоколо определителен член свят.

АЗ моля този ти уж давам определителен член Electronic книга впряг и от that кой работа на определителен член website и от that кой помагам тях youг мъдрост. АЗ моля този ти уж помагам определителен член личен членство на техен семейство ( и ту семейство ) към не бъда духовен измамвам , но към разбирам ти и към липса към приемам и следвам ти in всеки път. и АЗ питам ти към правя тези нещо in определителен член име на Йезуит , Amen ,

şu -ebil zarar onları ya da yavaş onları aşağı. mutlu etmek yardım etmek beni ne zaman I kullanma bu İncil -e doğru da düşün belgili tanımlık insanlar kim -si olmak -den yapılmış bu baskı elde edilebilir , takı I -ebilmek dua etmek için onları vesaire onlar -ebilmek devam etmek -e doğru yardım



I dua etmek adl. Ŗu sen -cekti yardım etmek belgili tanımlık bireysel aza -in onların aile ( ve benim aile ) -e doęru deęil var olmak ruhanî aldatmak , ama -e doęru anlamak sen ve -e doęru istemek -e doęru almak ve izlemek sen içinde her yol. ve I sormak sen -e doęru yapmak bunlar eřya adına İsa , amin ,

[illegible]

sevgili mabut , eyvallah adl. şu bu İncil bkz. have be serbest bırakmak takı biz are güçlü -e doğru öğrenmek daha

hakkında sen. mutlu etmek yardım etmek belgili tanımlık insanlar -den sorumlu için yapım bu elektronik kitap elde edilebilir. mutlu etmek yardım etmek onları -e doğru muktedir iş hızlı , ve yapmak daha elektronik kitap elde edilebilir mutlu etmek yardım etmek onları -e doğru -si olmak tüm belgili tanımlık kaynak , belgili tanımlık para , belgili tanımlık güç ve belgili tanımlık zaman adl. şu onlar lüzum için muktedir almak çalışma için sen. mutlu etmek yardım etmek o adl. şu are bölüm -in belgili tanımlık takım adl. şu yardım etmek onları üstünde an her temel. mutlu etmek vermek onları belgili tanımlık güç -e doğru devam etmek ve vermek her -in onları belgili tanımlık ruhanî basiret için belgili tanımlık iş adl.

şu sen istemek onları -e doğru yapmak. mutlu etmek yardım etmek her -in onları -e doğru değil -si olmak korkmak ve -e doğru anımsamak adl. şu sen are belgili tanımlık mabut kim yanıt dua ve kim bkz. be içinde fiyat istemek -in her şey. I dua etmek adl. şu sen -cekti yüreklendirmek onları , ve adl. şu sen korumak onları , ve belgili tanımlık iş & bakanlık adl. şu onlar are meşgul içinde. I dua etmek adl. şu sen -cekti korumak onları --dan belgili tanımlık ruhanî güç ya da diğer engel adl.

şu -ebil zarar onları ya da yavaş onları aşağı. mutlu etmek yardım etmek beni ne zaman I kullanma bu İncil -e doğru da düşün belgili tanımlık insanlar kim -si olmak -den yapılmış bu baskı elde edilebilir , takı I -ebilmek dua etmek için onları vesaire onlar -ebilmek devam etmek -e doğru yardım etmek daha insanlar I dua etmek adl. şu sen -cekti vermek beni a aşk -in senin kutsal kelime ( belgili tanımlık İncil ), ve adl. şu sen -cekti vermek beni ruhanî akıllılık ve discernment -e doğru bilmek sen daha iyi ve -e doğru anlamak belgili tanımlık döndürmemem adl. şu biz are canlı içinde. mutlu etmek yardım etmek beni -e doğru bilmek nasıl -e doğru dağıtmak ile belgili tanımlık müşkülât adl.

I dua etmek adl. ş u sen -cekti yardım etmek belgili tanımlık bireysel aza -in onların aile ( ve benim aile ) -e doğru değil var olmak ruhanî aldatmak , ama -e doğru anlamak sen ve -e doğru istemek -e doğru almak ve izlemek sen içinde her yol. ve I sormak sen -e doğru yapmak bunlar eşya adına İsa , amin ,

[illegible]

## Serbia – Servia - Serbian

Serbia Serbian Servian Prayer Isus Krist Molitva Bog Kako  
Moliti moci cuti moj molitva za pitati davati ponuditi mene  
otkriti duhovni Vodstvo

## Serbia - Prayer Requests (praying ) to God - explained in Serbian (servian) Language

Molitva za Bog ## Kako za Moliti za Bog  
Kako Bog moći čuti moj molitva  
Kako za pitati Bog za davati ponuditi mene  
Kako otkriti duhovni Vodstvo

Kako za naći predaja iz urok Raspoloženje

Kako za zasluga određeni član istinit Bog nad Nebo

Kako otkriti određeni član Hrišćanin Bog

Kako za moliti za Bog droz Isus Krist

JA imati nikada molitva pre nego

Važan za Bog

Bog željan ljubavi svaki osoba osoba

Isus Krist moći pomoć

Se Bog Biti stalo moj život

Molitva Traženju

stvar taj te moć oskudica za uzeti u obzir govorenje za Bog  
okolo Molitva Traženju kod te , okolo te

=====

**Govorenje za Bog , određeni član Kreator nad određeni  
član Svemir , određeni član Gospodar :**

1. taj te davati za mene određeni član hrabrost za moliti  
određeni član stvar taj JA potreba za moliti 2. taj te davati za  
mene određeni član hrabrost za verovati te pa primiti šta te  
oskudica raditi s moj život , umjesto mene uznijeti moj  
vlastiti volja ( namera ) iznad vaš.

3. taj te davati mene ponuditi ne career moj bojazan nad  
određeni član nepoznat za postati određeni član isprika ,  
inače određeni član osnovica umjesto mene ne za služiti  
you.

4. taj te davati mene ponuditi vidjeti pa učiti kako za imati  
određeni član duhovni sway JA potreba ( droz tvoj riječ

Biblija ) jedan ) umjesto određeni član događaj ispred pa P )  
umjesto moj vlastiti crew duhovni putovanje.

5. Taj te Bog davati mene ponuditi oskudica za služiti Te  
briny

6. Taj te podsetiti mene za razgovarati sa te prayerwhen ) JA  
sam frustriran inače u problemima , umjesto težak za odluka  
stvar ja sam jedini droz moj ljudsko biće sway.

7. Taj te davati mene Mudrost pa jedan srce ispunjen s  
Biblijski Mudrost tako da JA služiti te briny delotvorno.

8. Taj te davati mene jedan želja za učenje tvoj riječ , Biblija  
, ( određeni član Novi Zavjet Evanđelje nad Zahod ), na  
temelju jedan crew osnovica 9. taj te davati pomoć za mene  
tako da JA sam u mogućnosti za obaveštenje stvar unutra  
Biblija ( tvoj riječ ) šta JA moći osobno vezati za , pa taj  
volja pomoć mene shvatiti šta te oskudica mene raditi unutra  
moj život.

10. Taj te davati mene velik raspoznavanje , za shvatiti kako  
za objasniti za ostali tko te biti , pa taj JA moći učiti kako  
učiti pa knotkle kako za pristajati uza što te pa tvoj riječ (   
Biblija )

11. Taj te donijeti narod ( inače websites ) unutra moj život  
tko oskudica za knotkle te , pa tko biti jak unutra njihov  
precizan sporazum nad te ( Bog ); pa Taj te donijeti narod (   
inače websites ) unutra moj život tko će biti u mogućnosti za  
ohrabriti mene za točno učiti kako za podeliti Biblija reč nad  
istina (2 Timotej 215:).

12. Taj te pomoć mene učiti za imati velik sporazum okolo  
šta Biblija prikaz 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu najbolji , šta  
3. lice od TO BE u prezentu većina precizan , pa šta je preko

duhovni sway & snaga , pa šta prikaz složiti se s određeni član izvorni rukopis taj te nadahnut određeni član autorstvo nad određeni član Novi Zavjet za pisati.

13. Taj te davati ponuditi mene za korist moj vrijeme unutra jedan dobar put , pa ne za uzaludnost moj vrijeme na temelju Neistinit inače prazan metod za dobiti zaglavni kamen za Bog ( ipak taj nisu vjerno Biblijski ), pa kuda tim metod proizvod nijedan dug rok inače trajan duhovni voće.

14. Taj te davati pomoć za mene za shvatiti šta za tražiti unutra jedan crkva inače jedan mjesto nad zasluga , šta rod nad sumnja za pitati , pa taj te pomoć mene za naći vernik inače jedan parson s velik duhovni mudrost umjesto lak inače neistinit odgovor.

15. taj te uzrok mene za sećati se za sjećati se tvoj riječ Biblija ( takav kao Latinluk 8), tako da JA moći imati pik na moj srce pa imati moj pamćenje spreman , pa biti spreman za davati dobro odgovarati ostali nad određeni član nadati se taj JA imati okolo te.

16. Taj te donijeti ponuditi mene tako da moj vlastiti teologija pa doktrina za slagati tvoj riječ , Biblija pa taj te nastaviti za pomoć mene knotkle kako moj sporazum nad doktrina moći poboljšati tako da moj vlastiti život , stil života pa sporazum nastavlja da bude zaglavni kamen za šta te oskudica to da bude umjesto mene.

17. Taj te otvoren moj duhovni uvid ( zaključak ) sve više , pa taj kuda moj sporazum inače percepcija nad te nije precizan , taj te pomoć mene učiti tko Isus Krist vjerno 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu.

18. Taj te davati ponuditi mene tako da JA moći za odvojen iko neistinit obredni šta JA imati zavisnost na temelju , iz

tvoj jasan poučavanje unutra Biblija , ako postoje nad šta JA sam sledeće nije nad Bog , inače 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu u suprotnosti sa šta te oskudica za poučavati nama okolo sledeće te.

19. Taj iko sile nad urok ne oduteti iko duhovni sporazum šta JA imati , ipak radije taj JA zadržati određeni član znanje nad kako za knotkle te pa ne da bude lukav unutra ovih dan nad duhovni varka.

20. Taj te donijeti duhovni sway pa ponuditi mene tako da JA volja ne da bude dio nad određeni član Velik Koji pada Daleko inače nad iko pokret šta postojati produhovljeno krivotvoriti za te pa za tvoj Svet Riječ

21. Taj da onde 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu bilo što taj JA imati ispunjavanja unutra moj život , inače iko put taj JA ne imate odgovaranje za te ace JA treba imati pa taj 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu sprječavanje mene iz oba hodanje s te , inače imajući sporazum , taj te donijeti tim stvar / odgovor / događaj leđa u moj pamćenje , tako da JA odreći se njima u ime Isus Krist , pa svi nad njihov vrijednosni papiri pa posledica , pa taj te opet staviti iko praznina ,sadness inače očajavati unutra moj život s određeni član Radost nad određeni član Gospodar , pa taj JA postojati briny usredotočen na temelju znanje za sledii te kod čitanje tvoj riječ , određeni član Biblija

22. Taj te otvoren moj oči tako da JA moći za jasno vidjeti pa prepoznati da onde 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu jedan Velik Varka okolo Duhovni tema , kako za shvatiti današji fenomen ( inače ovih događaj ) iz jedan Biblijski perspektiva , pa taj te davati mene mudrost za knotkle i tako taj JA volja učiti kako za pomoć moj prijatelj pa voljen sam sebe ( rodbina ) ne postojati dio nad it.

23. Taj te osigurati taj jednom moj oči biti otvoreni pa moj pamćenje shvatiti određeni član duhovni izražajnost nad trenutni zbivanja uzimanje mjesto unutra određeni član svet , taj te pripremiti moj srce prihvatiti tvoj istina , pa taj te pomoć mene shvatiti kako za naći hrabrost pa sway droz tvoj Svet Riječ , Biblija. U ime Isus Krist , JA tražiti ovih stvar potvrđujući moj želja da bude složno tvoj volja , pa JA sam iskanje tvoj mudrost pa za imati jedan ljubav nad određeni član Istina Da

=====

Briny podno Stranica  
Kako za imati Vječan Život

=====

Nama biti dearth da današji foil ( nad molitva traženju za Bog ) 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu u mogućnosti za pomoći te. Nama shvatiti današji ne može biti određeni član najbolji inače većina delotvoran prevod. Nama shvatiti taj onde biti mnogobrojan različit putevi nad izraziv misao pa reči. Da te imati jedan sugestija umjesto jedan bolji prevod , inače da te sličan za uzeti jedan malen količina nad tvoj vrijeme za poslati sugestija nama , te će biti pomaganje hiljadu nad ostali narod isto , tko volja onda čitanje određeni član poboljšan prevod. Nama često imati jedan Novi Zavjet raspoloživ unutra tvoj jezik inače unutra jezik taj biti redak inače star.

Da te biti handsome umjesto jedan Novi Zavjet unutra jedan specifičan jezik , ugoditi pisati nama. Isto , nama oskudica da bude siguran pa probati za komunicirati taj katkada , nama činiti ponuda knjiga taj nisu Slobodan pa taj činiti koštati novac. Ipak da te ne moći priuštiti neki od tim elektronički knjiga , nama moći često činiti dobro razmena



nad elektronički knjiga umjesto pomoć s prevod inače prevod posao.

Te ne morati postojati jedan stručan radnik , jedini jedan pravilan osoba tko 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu zainteresiran za pomaganje. Te treba imati jedan računar inače te treba imati pristup za jedan računar kod tvoj meštanin biblioteka inače univerzitet inače univerzitet , otada tim obično imati bolji spoj za određeni član Internet. Te moći isto obično utemeljiti tvoj vlastiti crew SLOBODAN elektronski pošta račun kod lijevanje mail.yahoo.com

Ugoditi uzeti maloprije otkriti određeni član elektronski pošta adresa smješten podno inače određeni član kraj nad današji stranica. Nama nadati se te volja poslati elektronski pošta nama , da današji 3. lice od TO BE u prezentu nad pomoć inače hrabrenje. Nama isto ohrabriti te za dodir nama u vezi sa Elektronički Knjiga taj nama ponuda taj biti van koštati , pa slobodan.

Nama činiti imati mnogobrojan knjiga unutra stran jezik , ipak nama ne uvijek mjesto njima za primiti elektronski ( skidati podatke ) zato nama jedini napraviti raspoloživ određeni član knjiga inače određeni član tema taj biti preko zatražen. Nama ohrabriti te za nastaviti za moliti za Bog pa za nastaviti učiti okolo Njemu kod čitanje određeni član Novi Zavjet. Nama dobrodošao tvoj sumnja pa primedba kod elektronski pošta.



Te rog ajută-mă la spre know cum la spre deal cu art.hot.  
difficulties that I sînt confronted cu fiecare zi. Lord  
Dumnezeu , Ajută-mă help la spre nevoie la spre know tu  
Better și la spre nevoie la spre ajutor alt Creștin înăuntru  
meu arie și around art.hot. lume. I pray that tu trec.de la will  
a da art.hot.

Electronic carte team și aceia cine work pe website și aceia cine ajutor pe ei al tău wisdom. I pray that tu trec.de la will ajutor art.hot. individual members de lor familie ( și meu familie ) la spre nu a fi spiritually deceived , numai la spre understand tu și eu la spre nevoie la spre accent și a urma tu înăuntru fiecare way. și I a întreba tu la spre a face aceștia things în nume de Jesus , Amen ,

[illegible]

# Russian – Russe - *Russie*

## Russian Prayer Requests -

Молитва к  
бога как помолить к  
бога как бог может услышать моему  
молитве как спросить, что бог дал помощь к мне  
как найти духовное наведение  
как найти deliverance от злейшего  
духов как поклониться поистине бог  
рая как найти христианское  
бога как помолить к богу до  
jesus christ я никогда не молила перед  
важным к влюбленностям бога  
бога каждое индивидуальное  
jesus, котор персоны christ может помочь  
делает внимательность бога о моих вещах  
запросов молитве  
жизни вы могли хотеть для рассмотрения поговорить к  
богу о запросах молитве  
вами, о вас

=====

**Говорящ к богу, создатель вселенного, лорд:**

**1. вы дали бы к мне смелости помолить вещи я для  
того чтобы помолить**

2. вы дали бы к мне смелости верить вам и принимать  
вы хотите сделать с моей жизнью, вместо меня exalting  
мои воля (намерие) над твоим.

3. вы дали бы мне помощь для того чтобы не  
препятствовать моим страхам неиствения стать  
отговорками, или основа для меня, котор нужно не  
служить вы. 4. вы дали бы мне помощь для того чтобы

увидеть и выучить как иметь духовную прочность я (через ваше слово библия) а) для случаев вперед и б) для моего собственного личного духовного путешествия.

5. Что вы бог дали мне помощь для того чтобы хотеть служить вы больше

6. Что вы remind, что я разговаривал с вами (prayer)when я себя расстрою или в затруднении, вместо пытаться разрешить вещи только через мою людскую прочность.

7. Что вы дали мне премудрость и сердце наполнило с библейской премудростью так НОП я служил бы вы эффективно.

8. Что вы дали мне желание изучить ваше слово, библию, (Новый завет Gospel john), on a personal basis,

9. вы дали бы помощи к мне так, что я буду заметить вещи в библии (вашем слове) я могу лично отнести к, и которой поможет мне понять вы хотите меня сделать в моей жизни.

10. Что вы дали мне большое распознавание, для того чтобы понять как объяснить к другим которые вы, и что я мог выучить как выучить и суметь как стоять вверх для вас и вашего слова (библии)

11. Что вы принесли людей (или websites) в моей жизни хотят знать вас, и которые сильны в их точном вникании вас (бог); и то вы принесли бы людей (или websites) в моей жизни будет ободрить меня точно выучить как разделить библию слово правды (2 timothy 2:15).

12. Что вы помогли мне выучить иметь большое вникание о который вариант библии самые лучшие, который самый точный, и который имеет самые духовные прочность & силу, и которая вариант соглашается с первоначально рукописями что вы воодушевили авторы Новый завет написать.

13. Что вы дали помощь к мне для использования моего времени в хорошей дороге, и для того чтобы не расточительствовать мое время на ложных или пустых методах получить closer to бог (но то не будьте поистине библейск), и где те методы не производят никакой долгосрочный или lasting духовный плодощ.

14. Что вы дали помощь к мне понять look for в церковь или месте поклонения, что виды вопросов, котор нужно спросить, и что вы помогли мне найти верующих или pastor с большой духовной премудростью вместо легких или ложных ответов.

15. вы причинили бы меня вспомнить для того чтобы запомнить ваше слово библия (such as Romans 8), так, что я смогу иметь его в моем сердце и иметь мой разум быть подготовленным, и готово дать ответ к другому из упования которое я имею о вас.

16. Что вы принесли помощь к мне так НОП мои собственные теология и доктрины для того чтобы согласиться с вашим словом, библией и что вы продолжались помочь мне суметь как мое вникание доктрины можно улучшить так, что мои собственные жизнь, lifestyle и понимать будут продолжаться быть closer to вы хотите их быть для меня.

17. Что вы раскрыли мою духовную проницательность (заключения) больше и больше, и что где мои вникание или восприятие вас не точны, что вы помогли мне выучить *jesus christ* поистине.

18. Что вы дали помощь к мне так НОП я мог бы отделить любые ложные ритуалы я зависел на, от ваших ясных преподавательств в библии, если любое из, то я *following* не бога, или противоположны к вы хотите для того чтобы научить нам - о следовать за вами.

19. Что любые усилия зла *take away* нисколько духовное вникание я имею, но довольно что я сохранил знание как знать вас и быть обманутым внутри *these days* духовного обмана.

20. Что вы принесли духовную прочность и помогли к мне так НОП я не буду частью большой падать прочь или любого движения было бы духовност *counterfeit* к вам и к вашему святейшему слову.

21. То если что-нибудь, то я делал в моей жизни, или любая дорога что я не отвечал к вам по мере того как я должен иметь и то предотвращает меня от или гулять с вами, или иметь понимать, что вы принесли те *things/responses/events back into* мой разум, так НОП я отречься бы от их *in the name of jesus christ*, и все из их влияний и последствий, и что вы заменили любые *emptiness*, тоскливость или *despair* в моей жизни с утехой лорда, и что я больше был сфокусирован на учить последовать за вами путем читать ваше слово, библия.

22. Что вы раскрыли мои глаза так НОП я мог бы ясно увидеть и узнать если будет большой обман о духовных темах, то как понять это явление (или эти случаи) от

библейской перспективы, и что вы дали мне  
премудрость для того чтобы знать и так НОП я выучу  
как помочь моим друзьям и полюбил одни  
(родственники) для того чтобы не быть частью ее.

23 Что вы обеспечили что раз мои глаза раскрыны и мой  
разум понимает духовное значение текущие события  
принимая место в мире, что вы подготовили мое сердце  
для того чтобы признавать вашу правду, и что вы  
помогли мне понять как найти смелость и прочность  
через ваше святейшее слово, библию. In the name of  
jesus christ, я прошу эти вещи подтверждая мое желание  
быть в соответствии вашей волей, и я прошу ваша  
премудрость и иметь влюбленность правды, Аминь.

=====

Больше на дне страницы  
как иметь вечная жизнь

=====

Мы рады если этот список (запросов молитве к  
богу) может помочь вам. Мы понимаем это не может  
быть самый лучший или самый эффективный перевод.  
Мы понимаем что будут много по-разному дорог  
выражать мысли и слова. Если вы имеете предложение  
для более лучшего перевода, или если вы хотел были бы  
принять малое количество вашего времени послать  
предложения к нам, то вы будете помогать тысячам  
людям также, которые после этого прочитают  
улучшенный перевод. Мы часто имеем новый testament  
имеющийся в вашем языке или в языках редко или  
старо. Если вы смотрите для нового testament в  
специфически языке, то пожалуйста напишите к нам.





مددعاسي يذلاق يعرفل انم اعزجل لكشت يتل ا قدع اسملا عاجرلا  
منم لك اعطاعو رارمتسالا قوق اءى اطع ا جري .موي لك ساسا لىل ع  
دل عفت ن ا اءل دىرت يتل ل ام عا ل ل ي حورل ام هفل ا

رکذتل او فوخل مدغل مهنم لك قدعاسم عاجرل  
ءيش لك نع لوؤسمل او قالصل ابوجا يذل لئل اتنا نإ

& لمعل او ، مهتياحم مكن او ، مهعيجشرت متلضفت نأ لئل وعدأ  
هيف نوكراشي مهنأ قراز

نم اهريغ واهي حورل اتاوقل انم مهتياحم متلضفت نأ لئل وعدأ  
لفسأ لئا انم عطب واهمريض نأ نكمي يتل اتابقعل

اضي ركفنل ديدج دهع اذه مدختسا امدنع يتدعاسم عاجرل  
ناعي طتسا ىتح ، عحاتمل اهبطل اذه نم اولعج نيذل سانل  
ددع قدعاسم يفرارمتسالامل ينستي يتحو اهيلع ىلصي  
سانل نم ربكأ

(ديدل ادهعل) قسدقملا قملك كل بحيني طعت تنك نأ لئل وعدأ  
كن افرعت نأ من طفل او قملحل او هي حورل يني طعت فوس كن او ،  
اهيف شيعن يتل اةينمزل اقرتفل او مهفل لصفأ

تابوعصل اعم لاماعتل اةيفيك قفرعم يفي يتدعاسم عاجرل  
ناديرت يندعاسي لئل درولل .موي لك يينأ اءاوت يتل  
يفيني حييسمل نيرخال ادعاسن نأ ديرنو لصفأ كن افرعت  
مل اعلال وحو ققطنمل ايدلب

نيذل او بختنمل اينورتكلال باتكل ايطعي نأ مكل لئل وعدأ  
مكتمك حمدعاست

عدخي ال (يتلئاعو) اهترسادارفأ دعاسي نأ مكل لئل وعدأ  
قرطل لكب مكل عباتم ولوبق ديرتو مكب مهف نكلو ، ايحور

نأ مكنم بلطاو ، اتاوال اذه يفي هيجوتل او دعتمل انيطعي امك  
نيما ، عوسي مسإ يفي ايشال اذه لعفا

=====

## Prayer to God

Dear God,

Thank you that this Gospel or this New Testament has been released so that we are able to learn more about you.

Please help the people responsible for making this Electronic book available. You know who they are and you are able to help them.

Please help them to be able to work fast, and make more Electronic books available

Please help them to have all the resources, the money, the strength and the time that they need in order to be able to keep working for You.

Please help those that are part of the team that help them on an everyday basis. Please give them the strength to continue and give each of them the spiritual understanding for the work that you want them to do.

Please help each of them to not have fear and to remember  
that you are the God who answers prayer and who is in charge of everything.

I pray that you would encourage them, and that you protect them, and the work & ministry that they are engaged in.

I pray that you would protect them from the Spiritual

Forces or other obstacles that could harm them or slow them down.

Please help me when I use this New Testament to also think of the people who have made this edition available, so that I can pray for them and so they can continue to help more people.

I pray that you would give me a love of your Holy Word (the New Testament), and that you would give me spiritual wisdom and discernment to know you better and to understand the period of time that we are living in.

Please help me to know how to deal with the difficulties that I am confronted with every day. Lord God, Help me to want to know you Better and to want to help other Christians in my area and around the world.

I pray that you would give the Electronic book team and those who help them your wisdom. God, help me to understand you better. Please help my family to understand you better also.

I pray that you would help the individual members of their family (and my family) to not be spiritually deceived, but to understand you and to want to accept and follow you in every way.

Also give us comfort and guidance in these times and I ask you to do these things in the name of Jesus ,  
Amen,

=====

### BOOKS which may be of Interest to you, the Reader

[illegible]

Note: These Books listed below may be available at No cost, - in **PDF** - and Entirely **FREE** at:

<http://www.archive.org> [text]

or at

<http://books.google.com>

or – for those in Europe - at

<http://gallica.bnf.fr>

**or for FRENCH at**

<http://books.google.fr/books>

We encourage you to find out, and to keep separate copies on separate drives, in case your own computer should have occasional problems.

[illegible][illegible]

**Geneva Bible – Version of the Old Testament and New Testament produced starting around 1560. Produced with the help of T (Beza)., who also produced an accurate LATIN version of the New Testament, based on the Textus Receptus.**

**Bible of Jay Green – Jay Green was the Translator for the Trinitarian Bible Society. His work is based on the Ancient Koine Greek Text (Textus Receptus) from which he translated directly. His work encompasses both Hebrew as well as Koine Greek (The Greek spoken at the time of Jesus Christ).**

**R-La grande charte d'Angleterre ; ouvrage précédé d'un Précis – This is simply the MAGNA CHARTA, which recognizes liberty for everyone.**

Gallagher, Mason - Was the Apostle Peter ever at Rome

Cannon of the Old Testament and the New Testament  
or Why the Bible is Complete without the Apocrypha and  
unwritten Traditions by Professor Archibald Alexander  
Princeton Theological Seminary  
1851 - Presbyterian Board of Publications. [[available online Free](#) ]

Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records  
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE DOUBTS AND  
DISCOVERIES OF MODERN TIMES. by George  
Rawlinson - Lectures Delivered at Oxford University  
[[available online Free](#) ]

The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism - by George Stanley  
Faber - 1832 – 3 Vol / 3 Tomes [[available online Free](#) ]

The image-worship of the Church of Rome : proved to be  
contrary to Holy Scripture and the faith and discipline of the  
primitive church ; and to involve contradictory and  
irreconcilable doctrines within the Church of Rome itself  
(1847)  
by James Endell Tyler, 1789-1851

Calvin defended : a memoir of the life, character, and  
principles of John Calvin (1909) by Smyth, Thomas, 1808-  
1873 ; Publish: Philadelphia : Presbyterian Board of  
Publication. [[available online Free](#) ]



The Supreme Godhead of Christ, the Corner-stone of Christianity by W. Gordon - 1855[\[available online Free \]](#)

A history of the work of redemption containing the outlines of a body of divinity ...

Author: Edwards, Jonathan, 1703-1758.

Publication Info: Philadelphia,: Presbyterian board of publication, [\[available online Free \]](#)

The origin of pagan idolatry ascertained from historical testimony and circumstantial evidence. - by George Stanley Faber - 1816 3 Vol. / 3 Tomes [\[available online Free \]](#)

The Seventh General Council, the Second of Nicaea, Held A.D. 787, in which the Worship of Images was established - based on early documents by Rev. John Mendham - 1850 [documents how this far-reaching Council went away from early Christianity and the New Testament]

Worship of Mary by James Endell Tyler [\[available online Free \]](#)

The Papal System from its origin to the present time  
A Historical Sketch of every doctrine, claim and practice of the Church of Rome by William Cathcart, DD  
1872 – [\[available online Free \]](#)

The Protestant exiles of Zillerthal; their persecutions and expatriation from the Tyrol, on separating from the Romish church – [\[available online Free \]](#)

An essay on apostolical succession- being a defence of a genuine ministry – by Rev Thomas Powell - 1846

An inquiry into the history and theology of the ancient Vallenses and Albigenses; as exhibiting, agreeably to the promises, the perpetuity of the sincere church of Christ  
Publish info London, Seeley and Burnside, - by George Stanley Faber - 1838 [[available online Free](#) ]

The Israel of the Alps. A complete history of the Waldenses and their colonies (1875) by Alexis Muston (History of the Waldensians) – 2 Vol/ 2 Tome – Available in English and Separately ALSO in French [[available online Free](#) ]

## Encouragement for Women

Amy Charmichael

AMY CARMICHAEL - From Sunrise Land  
[[available online Free](#) ]

AMY CARMICHAEL - Lotus buds (1910)  
[[available online Free](#) ]

AMY CARMICHAEL - Overweights of joy (1906)  
[[available online Free](#) ]

AMY CARMICHAEL -Walker of Tinnevelly (1916)  
[[available online Free](#) ]

AMY CARMICHAEL -After Everest ; the experiences of a mountaineer and medical mission (1936)  
[[available online Free](#) ]

AMY CARMICHAEL -The continuation of a story ([1914

AMY CARMICHAEL -Ragland, pioneer (1922)

[available online Free]

[illegible]

## HISTORY OF HUNGARIAN CHRISTIANS

[illegible]

## HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN

HUNGARY By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE -

1854 [available online Free ]

## Hungary and Kossuth-An Exposition of the Late Hungarian Revolution by Tefft

1852 [available online Free ]

Secret history of the Austrian government and of its ...  
persecutions of Protestants By Joseph Alfred Michiels -

1859 [available online Free ]

Sketches in Remembrance of the Hungarian Struggle for  
Independence and National Freedom Edited by Kastner

(Circ. 1853) [available online Free ]



**GALLICA** – <http://gallica.bnf.fr>

Histoire ecclésiastique – 3 Tomes - by Théodore de Bèze,  
[available online Free ]

BEZE-Sermons sur l'histoire de la résurrection de Notre-  
Seigneur Jésus-Christ [available online Free ]

DE BEZE - Confession de la foy chrestienne [available  
online Free ]

Vie de J. Calvin by Théodore de Bèze, [available online  
Free ]

Confession d'Augsbourg (français). 1550-Melanchthon  
[available online Free ]

La BIBLE-l'éd. de, Genève-par F. Perrin, 1567 [available  
online Free ]

Hobbes - Léviathan ou La matière, la forme et la puissance  
d'un état ecclésiastique et civil [available online Free ]

L'Église et l'État à Genève du vivant de Calvin  
Roget, Amédée (1825-1883).  
[available online Free ]

LUTHER-Commentaire de l'épître aux Galates [available  
online Free ]

Petite chronique protestante de France [available online Free  
]

Histoire de la guerre des hussites et du Concile de Basle  
2 Tomes [recheck for accuracy]

Les Vaudois et l'Inquisition-par Th. de Cauzons (1908)  
[\[available online Free \]](#)

Glossaire vaudois-par P.-M. Callet [\[available online Free \]](#)

Musée des protestans célèbres ou Portraits et notices  
biographiques et littéraires des personnes les plus éminens  
dans l'histoire de la réformation et du protestantisme par une  
société de gens de lettres [\[available online Free \]](#)

( publ. par Mr. G. T. Doin; Publication : Paris : Weyer : Treuttel et Wurtz :  
Scherff [et al.], 1821-1824 - 6 vol./6 Tomes : ill. ; in-8  
Doin, Guillaume-Tell (1794-1854). Éditeur scientifique)

Notions élémentaires de grammaire comparée pour servir à  
l'étude des trois langues classiques [\[available online Free \]](#)

Thesaurus graecae linguae ab Henrico Stephano constructus.  
Tomus I : in quo praeter alia plurima quae primus praestitit  
vocabula in certas classes distribuit, multiplici derivatorum  
serie...

( Estienne, Henri (1528-1598). Auteur du texte Tomus I,II,III,IV : in quo  
praeter alia plurima quae primus praestitit vocabula in certas classes  
distribuit, multiplici derivatorum serie; Thesaurus graecae linguae ab  
Henrico Stephano constructus ) [\[available online Free \]](#)

La liberté chrétienne; étude sur le principe de la piété chez  
Luther ; Strasbourg, Librairie Istra, 1922 - Will, Robert  
[\[available online Free \]](#)

Bible-N.T.(français)-1523 - Lefèvre d'Étaples [\[available  
online Free \]](#)

Calvin considéré comme exégète - Par Auguste Vesson  
[\[available online Free \]](#)



Biblia en lengua española traduzida palabra por palabra de la verdad hebrayca-FERRARA

Biblia. Español 11602-translationes por Cypriano de Valera ( misspelled occasionally as Cypriano de Varela ) [[available online Free](#) ]

Reina Valera 1602 – New Testament Available at [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org) [[available online Free](#) ]

La Biblia : que es, los sacros libros del Vieio y Nuevo Testamento

Valera, Cipriano de, 1532-1625

Los dos tratados del papa, i de la misa - escritos por Cipriano D. Valera ; i por él publicados primero el a. 1588, luego el a. 1599; i ahora fielmente reimpresos [Madrid], 1851 [[available online Free](#) ]

Valera, Cipriano de, 1532?-1625

Aviso a los de la iglesia romana, sobre la indiccion de jubiléo, por la bulla del papa Clemente octavo.

English Title = An ansvere or admonition to those of the Church of Rome, touching the iubile, proclaimed by the bull, made and set foorth by Pope Clement the eyght, for the yeare of our Lord. 1600. Translated out of French [[available online Free](#) ]

Spanish Protestants in the Sixteenth Century by Cornelius August Wilkens French [[available online Free](#) ]

Historia de Los Protestantes Españoles Y de Su Persecucion Por Felipe II – Adolfo de Castro – 1851 (also Available in English) [[available online Free](#) ]

The Spanish Protestants and Their Persecution by Philip II



– 1851 - Adolfo de Castro [[available online Free](#) ]

Institucion de la religion christiana;  
Institutio Christianae religionis. Spanish  
Calvin, Jean, 1509-1564

Institución religiosa escrita por Juan Calvino el año 1536 y  
traduzida al castellano por Cipriano de Valera.  
Calvino, Juan.

Catecismo que significa: forma de instruccion, que contiene  
los principios de la religion de dios, util y necessario para  
todo fiel Christiano : compuesto en manera de dialogo,  
donde pregunta el maestro, y responde el discipulo  
En casa de Ricardo del Campo, M.D.XCVI [1596] Calvino,  
Juan.

Tratado para confirmar los pobres catiuos de Berueria en la  
catolica y antigua se, y religion Christiana: y para los  
consolar con la Palabra de Dios en las afliciones que  
padecen por el evangelio de Iesu Christo. [...] Al fin deste  
tratado hallareys un enxambre de los falsos milagros, y  
illusiones del Demonio con que Maria de la visitacion priora  
de la Anunciada de Lisboa engaño à muy muchos: y de  
como fue descubierta y condenada al fin del año de .1588  
En casa de Pedro Shorto, Año de. 1594  
Valera, Cipriano de,

Biblia de Ferrara, corregida por Haham R. Samuel de  
Casseres

The Protestant exiles of Madeira (c1860) French [[available  
online Free](#) ]

[illegible]

## HISTORY OF VERSIONS of the NEW TESTAMENT

**Part A – For your consideration**

[illegible]

**For Christians who want a serious, detailed and historical account of the versions of the New Testament, and of the issues involved in the historic defense of authentic and true Christianity.**

John William Burgon [ Oxford] -1 The traditional text of the Holy Gospels vindicated and established (1896) [[available online Free](#) ]

John William Burgon [ Oxford] -2 The causes of the corruption of the traditional text of the Holy Gospel  
[available online Free ]

John William Burgon [ Oxford] – The Revision Revised  
(A scholarly in-depth defense of Ancient Greek Text of the  
New Testament) [\[available online Free \]](#)

Intro to Vol 1 from INTRO to MASSORETICO CRITICAL  
by GINSBURG-VOL 1 [available online Free ]

Intro to Vol 1 from INTRO to MASSORETICO CRITICAL  
by GINSBURG-VOL 2 [available online Free ]

**Horæ Mosaicæ;** or, A view of the Mosaical records, with respect to their coincidence with profane antiquity; their

internal credibility; and their connection with Christianity; comprehending the substance of eight lectures read before the University of Oxford, in the year 1801; pursuant to the will of the late Rev. John Bampton, A.M. / By George Stanley Faber -Oxford : The University press, 1801  
[Topic: defense of the authorship of Moses and the historical accuracy of the Old Testament] [[available online Free](#) ]

TC The English Revisers' Greek Text-Shown to be Unauthorized, Except by Egyptian Copies Discarded  
[[available online Free](#) ]

CANON of the Old and New Testament by Archibald Alexander [[available online Free](#) ]

An inquiry into the integrity of the Greek Vulgate- or, Received text of the New Testament 1815 92mb [[available online Free](#) ]

A vindication of 1 John, v. 7 from the objections of M. Griesbach [[available online Free](#) ]

The Burning of the Bibles- Defence of the Protestant Version – Nathan Moore - 1843

A dictionarie of the French and English tongues 1611  
Cotgrave, Randle - [[available online Free](#) ]

The Canon of the New Testament vindicated in answer to the objections of J.T. in his Amyntor, with several additions  
[[available online Free](#) ]

the paramount authority of the Holy Scriptures vindicated (1868)



Resurrection of Jesus Christ, or the necessity of Personal Repentance for Salvation.

The Translations have been accomplished all around the world in many languages, starting with changeover from the older accurate Greek Text, to the modern invented one, starting between 1904 and 1910 depending on which edition, which translation team, and which publisher.

We cannot recommend: the New Testament or Bible of Louis Segond. This man was probably well intentioned, but his translation are actually based on the 8<sup>th</sup> Critical edition of Tischendorf, who opposed the Reformation, the Historicity of the Books of the Bible, and the Greek Text used by Christians for thousands of years.

For additional information on versions, type on the Internet Search: “verses missing in the NIV” and you will find more material.

We cannot recommend the english-language NKJV, even though it claims to depend on the Textus Receptus. That is not exactly accurate. The NKJV makes this claim based on the eclectic [mixed and confused] greek text collated officially by Herman von Soden. The problem is that von Soden did not accomplish this by himself and used 40 assistants, without recording who chose which text or the names of those students. Herman Hoskier [Scholar, University of Michigan] was accurate in demonstrating the links between Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and the Greek Text of Von Soden. Thus what is explained as being “based on” the Textus Receptus actually was a departure from that very text.

The Old Testaments of almost all modern language Bibles, in almost all languages is a CHANGED text. It does NOT conform to the historic Old Testament, and is based instead on the recent work of the German Kittel, who can be easily considered an Apostate by historic Lutheran standards. (more in a momentf).

The Old Testament of the NKJV is based on the New Hebrew Translation of Kittel. [die Biblia Hebraica von Rudolf Kittel ] Kittel remains problematic for his own approach to translation.

Kittel, the translator of the Old Testament [for almost all modern editions of the Bible]:

1. Did not believe that the Pentateuch he translated was accurate.
2. Did not believe that the Pentateuch he translated was the same as the original Pentateuch.
3. Did not believe in the inspiration of the Old Testament or the New Testament.
4. Did not believe in what Martin Luther would believe would constitute Salvation (salvation by Faith alone, in Christ Jesus alone).
5. Considered the Old Testament to be a mixture compiled by tribes who were themselves confused about their own religion.

Most people today who are Christians would consider Kittel to be a Heretical Apostate since he denies the inspiration of the Bible and the accuracy of the words of Jesus in the New Testament. Kittel today would be refused to be allowed to be a Pastor or a translator. His translation work misleads

and misguides people into error, whenever they read his work.

The Evidence against Kittel is not small. It is simply the work of Kittel himself, and what he wrote. Much of the evidence can be found in:

*A history of the Hebrews (1895) by R Kittel – 2 Vol*

Essentially, Kittel proceeds from a number of directions to undermine the Old Testament and the history of the Hebrews, by pretending to take a scholarly approach. Kittel did not seem to like the Hebrews much, but he did seem to like ancient pagan and mystery religions. (see the Two Babylons by Hislop, or History of the Temple by Edersheim, and then compare).

His son Gerhard Kittel, a “scholar” who worked for the German Bible Society in Germany in World War II, with full aproval of the State, ALSO was not a Christian and would ALSO be considered an apostate. Gerhard Kittel served as advisor to the leader of Germany in World War II. After the war, Gerhard Kittel was tried for War Crimes.

On the basis of the Documentation, those who believe in the Bible and in Historic Christianity are compelled to find ALTERNATIVE texts to the Old Testament translated by Kittel or the New Testaments that depart from the historic Ancient Koine Greek.

Both Kittel Sr and Kittel Jr appear to have been false Christians, and may continue to mislead many. People who cannot understand how this can happen may want to read a few books including :

Seduction of Christianity by Dave Hunt.

The Agony of Deceit by Horton  
Hidden Dangers of the Rainbow by C. Cumbey  
The Battle for the Bible by Harold Lindsell (Editor of  
Christianity Today)

Those who want more information about Kittel should consult:

- 1) Problems with Kittel – Short paper sometimes available online or at [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org)
- 2) The Theological Faculty of the University of Jena during the Third .... in PDF [can be found online sometimes] by S. Heschel, Professor, Dartmouth College
- 3) Theologians under .... : Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus, and Emanuel Hirsch / Robert P. Ericksen.  
Publish info New Haven : **Yale University** Press, 1985.  
(New Haven, 1987)
- 4) Leonore Siegele - Wenschkewitz, Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor der Judenfrage: Gerhard Kittels theologische Arbeit im Wandel deutscher Geschichte (München: Kaiser, 1980).
- 5) Rethinking the German Church Struggle  
by John S. Conway [online]  
<http://motlc.wiesenthal.com/resources/books/annual4/chap18.html>
- 6) Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust  
by Robert P. Ericksen (Editor), Susannah Heschel (Editor)



Psalm 50:15

15 And call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me.

Psalm 90

91:1 He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

2 I will say of the LORD, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God; in him will I trust.

3 Surely he shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence.

4 He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust: his truth shall be thy shield and buckler.

5 Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day;

6 Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday.

7 A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.

8 Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked.

9 Because thou hast made the LORD, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation;

10 There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling.

11 For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12 They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

13 Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.

14 Because he hath set his love upon me, therefore will I deliver him: I will set him on high, because he hath known my name.

15 He shall call upon me, and I will answer him: I will be with him in trouble; I will deliver him, and honour him.

16 With long life will I satisfy him, and show him my salvation.

### Psalm 23

23:1 A Psalm of David. The LORD is my shepherd; I shall not want.

2 He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters.

3 He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.

4 Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.

5 Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

6 Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the LORD for ever.

# With My Whole Heart - With all my heart

## "with my whole heart"

If we truly expect God to respond to us, we must be willing to make the commitment to Him **with our whole heart**.

This means making a commitment to Him with our ENTIRE, or ALL of our heart. Many people do not want to be **truly** committed to God. They simply want God to rescue them at that moment, so that they can continue to ignore Him and refuse to do what they should. God knows those who ask help sincerely and those who do not. God knows each of our thoughts. God knows our true intentions, the intentions we consciously admit to, and the intentions we may not want to admit to. God knows us better than we know ourselves. When we are truly and honestly and sincerely praying to find God, and wanting Him with all of our heart, or with our whole heart, THAT is when God DOES respond.

What should people do if they cannot make this commitment to God, or if they are afraid to do this ?  
Pray :

*Lord God, I do not know you well enough, please help me to know you better, and please help me to understand you. Change my desire to serve you and help me to want to be committed to you with my whole heart. I pray that you would send into my life those who can help me, or places where I can find accurate information about You. Please preserve me and help me grow so that I can be entirely committed to you. In the name of Jesus, Amen.*

Here are some verses in the Bible that demonstrate that God responds to those who are committed with their whole heart.

(Psa 9:1 KJV) To the chief Musician upon Muthlabben, A Psalm of David. I will praise thee, O LORD **with my whole heart**; I will show forth all thy marvellous works.

(Psa 111:1 KJV) Praise ye the LORD. I will praise the LORD **with my whole heart**, in the assembly of the upright, and in the congregation.

(Psa 119:2 KJV) Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek him **with my whole heart**.

(Psa 119:10 KJV) **With my whole heart** have I sought thee: O let me not wander from thy commandments.

(Psa 119:34 KJV) Give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law; yea, I shall observe **with my whole heart**.

(Psa 119:58 KJV) I entreated thy favour **with my whole heart**: be merciful unto me according to thy word.

(Psa 119:69 KJV) The proud have forged a lie against me: but I will keep thy precepts **with my whole heart**.

(Psa 119:145 KJV) KOPH. I cried **with my whole heart**; hear me, O LORD: I will keep thy statutes.

(Psa 138:1 KJV) A Psalm of David. I will praise thee **with my whole heart**: before the gods will I sing praise unto thee.

(Isa 1:5 KJV) Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint.

(Jer 3:10 KJV) And yet for all this her treacherous sister Judah hath not turned unto **me with her whole heart**, but feignedly, saith the LORD.

(Jer 24:7 KJV) And I will give them an heart to know me, that I am the LORD: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God: for they shall return unto me **with their whole heart**.

(Jer 32:41 KJV) Yea, I will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them in this land assuredly **with my whole heart** and with my whole soul.

**I Peter 3:15 But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear:**

II Timothy 2: 15 Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.



قد فرغ من الصلاة والسلام

الحمد لله

الحمد لله رب العالمين

كتاب



اسماء اسفار العهد الجديد وعدد اصحابها

٦	•	•	•	١ تيموثاوس	٢٨	•	•	اصحابه	انجيل متى
٤	•	•	•	٢ تيموثاوس	١٦	•	•	"	انجيل مرقس
٢	•	•	•	٢٤ تيطس	٢٤	•	•	"	انجيل لوقا
١	•	•	•	٢١ فلپمون	٢١	•	•	"	انجيل يوحنا
١٣	•	•	•	٢٨ العبرانيين	٢٨	•	•	"	اعمال الرسل
٥	•	•	•	١٦ يعقوب	١٦	•	•	"	رومية
٥	•	•	•	١ بطرس	١٦	•	•	"	١ كورنثوس
٢	•	•	•	٢ بطرس	١٣	•	•	"	٢ كورنثوس
٥	•	•	•	١ يوحنا	٦	•	•	"	غلاطية
١	•	•	•	٢ يوحنا	٦	•	•	"	افسس
١	•	•	•	٢ يوحنا	٤	•	•	"	فيلبي
١	•	•	•	يهوذا	٤	•	•	"	كولوسي
٢٢	•	•	•	رويا يوحنا	٥	•	•	"	١ تسالونيكي
				وجميعها سبعة وعشرون سفرًا	٢	•	•	"	٢ تسالونيكي

## انجيل متى

### الاصحاح الاول

١. اكتاب ميلاد يسوع المسيح ابن داود ابن ابرهيم\* ابرهيم ولد اسحق واسحق ولد يعقوب.  
 ٢. ويعقوب ولد يهوذا واخوته. ٣. ويهوذا ولد فارص وزارح من ثامار. وفارص ولد حصرون.  
 ٤. وحصرون ولد ارام. ٥. وارام ولد عميناداب. وعميناداب ولد نحشون. ونحشون ولد سلمون.  
 ٦. وسلمون ولد يوعز من راحاب. ويوعز ولد عوييد من راعوث. وعوييد ولد يسي. ٧. وبسي ولد  
 داود الملك. وداود الملك ولد سليمان من التي لاوريا. ٨. وسليمان ولد رحبعام. ورحبعام ولد  
 اييا. واييا ولد آسا. ٩. وآسا ولد يوشافاط. ويوشافاط ولد يورام. ويورام ولد عزريا.  
 ١٠. وعزيا ولد يوثام. ويوثام ولد احاز. واحاز ولد حزقيا. ١١. وحزقيا ولد منسي. ومنسي ولد آمون. وآمون  
 ولد يوشيا. ١٢. ويوشيا ولد ييكيا واخوته عند سبي بابل. ١٣. وبعد سبي بابل ييكيا ولد شلتائيل.  
 ١٤. وشلتائيل ولد زربابل. ١٥. وزربابل ولد ابيهود. وابيهود ولد الياقيم. والياقيم ولد عازور.  
 ١٦. وعازور ولد صادق. وسادوق ولد اخيم. واخيم ولد ابود. ١٧. وابود ولد اليعازر. واليعازر  
 ولد مئان. ومئان ولد يعقوب. ١٨. ويعقوب ولد يوسف رجل مريم التي وُلِدَ منها يسوع الذي  
 يدعى المسيح\* ١٩. فجميع الاجيال من ابرهيم الى داود اربعة عشر جيلاً. ومن داود الى سبي بابل  
 اربعة عشر جيلاً. ومن سبي بابل الى المسيح اربعة عشر جيلاً.

٢٠. اما ولادة يسوع المسيح فكانت هكذا. لما كانت مريم امه مخطوبة ليوسف قبل ان يجتمعا  
 ووجدت حبل من الروح القدس\* ٢١. فيوسف رجلاً اذ كان باراً ولم يشأ ان يشهرها اراد تخليتها  
 سراً\* ٢٢. ولكن فيما هو متفكر في هذه الامور اذا ملاك الرب قد ظهر له في حلم قائلاً يا يوسف  
 ابن داود لا تخف ان تأخذ مريم امرأتك. لان الذي حبل به فيها هو من الروح القدس.  
 ٢٣. فستلد ابناً وتدعو اسمه يسوع. لانه يخلص شعبه من خطاياهم\* ٢٤. وهذا كله كان لكي يتم ما قيل  
 من الرب بالنبى القائل ٢٥. هوذا العذراء تحبل وتلد ابناً ويدعون اسمه عمانوئيل الذي تفسيره  
 الله معنا

٢٦. فلما استيقظ يوسف من النوم فعل كما امره ملاك الرب واخذ امرأته\* ٢٧. ولم يعرفها حتى  
 ولدت ابناً البكر. ودعا اسمه يسوع

### الاصحاح الثاني

١. ولما وُلِدَ يسوع في بيت لحم اليهودية في أيام هيرودس الملك اذا مجوس من المشرق قد





کتاب

پیمان تازه

خداوند وراننده ما

عیسی مسیح

که از لسان اصلی یونانی

بفارسی

ترجمه کرده

افضل الفضلا المسيحيه

هنرمی مارتن کشیس انگلیسی ایست

---

که در دار السلطنت لندن محروسه

باعانت مجمع مشهور به بیبل سوسیته

کرت سیم بدار الطباعة بنده کمترین رچارد واطس

انگلیسی مطبوع کردید

۱۸۳۷

مسیحیه

# فهرست این کتاب مقدس

رسالهٔ دویم پولس بتسلنقیان . . . 503	انجیل متی آغاز میکند در
رسالهٔ اول پولس بتیموثیوس . . . 507	صحیفهٔ . . . . . 1
رسالهٔ دویم پولس بتیموثیوس . . . 516	انجیل مرقس . . . . . 83
رسالهٔ پولس بتیتوس . . . . . 522	انجیل لوقا . . . . . 135
رسالهٔ پولس بفلیمون . . . . . 526	انجیل یوحنا . . . . . 221
رسالهٔ پولس بعبریان . . . . . 528	کتاب اعمال حواریان . . . . . 288
رسالهٔ عام یعقوب حواری . . . . . 552	رسالهٔ پولس حواری باهل روم . . . 371
رسالهٔ عام اول پطرس حواری . . . 561	رسالهٔ پولس حواری باهل قرنٹس . . 405
رسالهٔ عام دویم پطرس حواری . . . 570	رسالهٔ دویم پولس حواری باهل
رسالهٔ عام اول یوحناي حواری . . . 576	قونٹس . . . . . 437
رسالهٔ عام ثاني یوحناي حواری . . . 585	رسالهٔ پولس حواری بکلتيان . . . 459
رسالهٔ عام سیم یوحناي حواری . . . 586	رسالهٔ پولس حواری بافسیان . . . 470
رسالهٔ عام یہوداي حواری . . . . . 587	رسالهٔ پولس حواری باهل فيليبي . . 481
کتاب مکاشفات یوحناي الہي . . . 590	رسالهٔ پولس حواری بقلسیان . . . 489
	رسالهٔ اول پولس بتسلنقیان . . . 496





LE  
NOUVEAU TESTAMENT

DE  
NOTRE SEIGNEUR JÉSUS-CHRIST

---

D'APRÈS LA VERSION REVUE

Par J. F. OSTERVOLD



PARIS  
SOCIÉTÉ BIBLIQUE DE FRANCE  
41, RUE LA BRUYÈRE

1872

One of the Reliable copies of the French New Testament - Une Bible fidele.

Available sometimes [and Free (gratis) ] at [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org)



# TABLE DES LIVRES

## DU NOUVEAU TESTAMENT

	Nombre des chap.	Pages		Nombre des chap.	Pages.
Évangile selon saint Matthieu .	28	1	I <sup>re</sup> Épître aux Thessaloniens.	3	323
Évangile selon saint Marc . . .	16	52	I <sup>re</sup> Épître à Timothée . . . . .	6	326
Évangile selon saint Luc . . . .	24	85	II <sup>e</sup> Épître à Timothée . . . . .	4	332
Évangile selon saint Jean . . . .	21	139	Épître à Tite . . . . .	3	336
Les Actes des Apôtres . . . . .	23	179	Épître à Philémon . . . . .	1	339
Épître de saint Paul aux Ro-			Épître aux Hébreux . . . . .	13	340
mains . . . . .	16	232	Épître de saint Jacques . . . . .	5	357
I <sup>re</sup> Épître aux Corinthiens . . . .	16	255	I <sup>re</sup> Épître de saint Pierre . . . . .	5	362
II <sup>e</sup> Épître aux Corinthiens . . . .	13	277	II <sup>e</sup> Épître de saint Pierre . . . . .	3	369
Épître aux Galates . . . . .	6	292	I <sup>re</sup> Épître de saint Jean . . . . .	5	373
Épître aux Éphésiens . . . . .	6	300	II <sup>e</sup> Épître de saint Jean . . . . .	1	379
Épître aux Philippiens . . . . .	4	307	III <sup>e</sup> Épître de saint Jean . . . . .	1	380
Épître aux Colossiens . . . . .	4	313	Épître de saint Jude . . . . .	1	381
I <sup>re</sup> Épître aux Thessaloniens.	5	318	Apocalypse de saint Jean . . . . .	22	383

Le signe ¶ indique la division du texte en paragraphes.

La Bible la plus fidele = Texte Recu - Grec Koine - d'Estienne (1550-51)



# BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Matthew	...	...	...	28
Mark	...	...	...	16
Luke	...	...	...	24
John	...	...	...	21
The Acts	...	...	...	28
Epistle to the Romans	...	...	...	16
I. Corinthians	...	...	...	16
II. Corinthians	...	...	...	13
Galatians	...	...	...	6
Ephesians	...	...	...	6
Philippians	...	...	...	4
Colossians	...	...	...	4
I. Thessalonians	...	...	...	5
II. Thessalonians	...	...	...	3
I. Timothy	...	...	...	6
II. Timothy	...	...	...	4
Titus	...	...	...	3
Philemon	...	...	...	1
Hebrews	...	...	...	13
Epistle of James	...	...	...	5
I. Peter	...	...	...	5
II. Peter	...	...	...	3
I. John	...	...	...	5
II. John	...	...	...	1
III. John	...	...	...	1
Jude	...	...	...	1
Revelation	...	...	...	22

# 錄目書全約新

章八十二計	書音福傳太馬
章六十計	書音福傳可馬
章四十二計	書音福傳加路
章一十二計	書音福傳翰約
章八十二計	傳行徒使
章六十計	書人馬羅達
章六十計	書前人多林哥達
章三十計	書後人多林哥達
章六計	書人太拉加達
章六計	書人所弗以達
章四計	書人比立腓達
章四計	書人西羅哥達
章五計	書前人迦尼羅撒帖達
章三計	書後人迦尼羅撒帖達
章六計	書前太摩提達
章四計	書後太摩提達
章三計	書多提達
章一計	書門立腓達
章三十計	書人來伯希達
章五計	書各雅
章五計	書前得彼
章三計	書後得彼
章五計	書一第翰約
章一計	書二第翰約
章一計	書三第翰約
章一計	書大猶
章二十二計	錄示默翰約

**Chinese Simplified - Request to God**

。  
=====

亲爱的上帝, 谢谢这新约被发布了以便我们能学会更多关于您。

请帮助人民负责任对使这本电子书可利用。请帮助他们能快速地工作, 和使更加电子书可利用 请帮助他们有他们需要为了能继续工作为您的所有资源、金钱、力量和时间。

请帮助那些是队的一部分每天帮助他们。

请给他们力量继续和给每个他们精神理解为工作, 您要他们做。

请帮助每个他们没有恐惧和不记得, 您是回答祷告并且是负责一切的上帝。

我祈祷, 您会鼓励他们, 并且您保护他们, 并且工作& 部他们参与。

我祈祷, 您会保护他们免受能危害他们或减慢他们下来的精神力量或其它障碍。

请帮助我当我使用这新约使这编辑可利用并且的认为人民, 以便我能祈祷为他们和因此他们能继续帮助更多人民 我祈祷, 您会给我您的圣洁词(新约) 爱, 并且您会给我精神智慧和法眼认识您更多和了解我们是生存在的时期。

请帮助我会对付困难, 我与每天被面对。

God 阁下, 帮助我想要认识您更多和想要帮助其它基督徒在我的区域和在世界。

我祈祷, 您会给从事网站的电子书队和那些并且那些帮助他们您的智慧。

我祈祷, 您会帮助他们的家庭(和我家的) 各自的成员精神上不被欺骗, 但明白您和想要接受和跟随您用每个方式。 并且我要求您做这些事以耶稣的名义, 阿门,

=====

Chinese Traditional - Talking to the Lord of Heaven

親愛的上帝, 謝謝這新約被發布了以便我們能學會更多關於您。 請幫助人民負責任對使這本電子書可利用。請幫助他們能快速地工作, 和使更加電子的書可利用 請幫助他們有他們需要為了能繼續工作為您的所有資源、金錢、力量和時間。

請幫助那些是隊的一部分每天幫助他們。請給他們力量繼續和給每個他們精神理解為工作, 您要他們做。請幫助每個他們沒有恐懼和不記得, 您是回答禱告並且是負責一切的上帝。我祈禱, 您會鼓勵他們, 並且您保護他們, 並且工作& 部他們參與。 我祈禱, 您會保護他們免受能危害他們或減慢他們下來的精神力量或其它障礙。

請幫助我當我使用這新約使這編輯可利用並且的認為人民, 以便我能祈禱為他們和因此他們能繼續幫助更多人民 我祈禱, 您會給我您的聖潔詞(新約) 愛, 並且您會給我精神智慧和法眼認識您更多和瞭解我們是生存在的時期。請幫助我會對付困難, 我與每天被面對。

God 閣下, 幫助我想要認識您更多和想要幫助其它基督徒在我的區域和在世界。 我祈禱, 您會給從事網站的電子書隊和那些並且那些幫助他們您的智慧。

我祈禱, 您會幫助他們的家庭(和我家的) 各自的成員精神上不被欺騙, 但明白您和想要接受和跟隨您用每個方式。 並且我要求您做這些事以耶穌的名義, 阿門,

## Chinese Traditional - Request to God

。

=====

親愛的上帝, 謝謝這新約被發布了以便我們能學會更多關於您。

請幫助人民負責任對使這本電子書可利用。請幫助他們能快速地工作, 和使更加電子的書可利用 請幫助他們有他們需要為了能繼續工作為您的所有資源、金錢、力量和時間。

請幫助那些是隊的一部分每天幫助他們。請給他們力量繼續和給每個他們精神理解為工作, 您要他們做。請幫助每個他們沒有恐懼和不記得, 您是回答禱告並且是負責一切的上帝。

我祈禱, 您會鼓勵他們, 並且您保護他們, 並且工作& 部他們參與。我祈禱, 您會保護他們免受能危害他們或減慢他們下來的精神力量或其它障礙。

請幫助我當我使用這新約使這編輯可利用並且的認為人民, 以便我能祈禱為他們和因此他們能繼續幫助更多人民 我祈禱, 您會給我您的聖潔詞(新約) 愛, 並且您會給我精神智慧和法眼認識您更多和瞭解我們是生存在的時期。

請幫助我會對付困難, 我與每天被面對。

God 閣下, 幫助我想要認識您更多和想要幫助其它基督徒在我的區域和在世界。我祈禱, 您會給從事網站的電子書隊和那些並且那些幫助他們您的智慧。

我祈禱, 您會幫助他們的家庭(和我家的) 各自的成員精神上不被欺騙, 但明白您和想要接受和跟隨您用每個方式。並且我要求您做這些事以耶穌的名義, 阿門,

=====

,  
 . 가  
 ,  
 가  
 .  
 , & 가  
 가  
 ,  
 가  
 ,  
 가  
 가. 가  
 1 . God  
 가  
 가 ( 가 )  
 1 가,  
 ,  
 ,A

## Japanese - Request to God

=====

親愛なる神、私達があなたについての詳細を学べるようにこの新約聖書が解放されたことありがとう。この電子本を使用できるようにさせる為に責任がある人々を助けなさい。それらを速く働ける助け電子本を使用できるようにさせなさい。それらがあなたのために働き続けられる必要とする資源すべて、お金、強さおよび時間があるのを助けなさい。

チームの部分であるそれらを助けなさいそれらを毎日助ける。それらにしてほしいことそれらのそれぞれに仕事のための精神的な理解を続け、与えるためにそれらに強さを与えなさい。それらのそれぞれが恐れを持たないのをそして祈りに答えるすべてを担当し、神であることを覚えなさいのを助けなさい。私によっては従事していることそれらを励ます、仕事及び大臣保護することそれらを、ことが祈り。

私によってはそれらに害を与えか、または遅らせることができる他の障害か精神的な力からそれらを保護することが祈る。私がそれら及び従ってことができるように、私がまたこの版を使用できるようにさせた人々について考えるのにこの新約聖書を使用するとき私を助けなさいそれらのために祈るより多くの人々を助け続けることができる。私によっては私にあなたの神聖な単語(新約聖書)の愛を与えること、そして祈るもっとよく知り、私達が生きている一定期間を理解するために私に精神的な知恵および大きい理解を与えることが。私が毎日と直面されること私が難しさを取扱う方法を知るのを助けなさい。

God 主は、私がもっとよく知り、私の区域のそして世界中の他のクリスチャンを助けたいと思いたいと思うのを助ける。私によってはウェブサイトに取り組むおよびそれらを与える電子それらをあなたの知恵助ける本のチームをおよびチームをことが祈る。私によっては家族(および私の家族)の個々のメンバーが精神的に欺かれないのを助ける言うことがわかり、あらゆる方法で受け入れ、続けたいと思うためにことが祈る。そして私はイエス・キリストの名でこれらの事を、アーメンするように頼む、

=====



## Gebet zum Gott

Lieber Gott, Danke, daß dieses Evangelium oder dieses neue Testament freigegeben worden ist, damit wir in der LageSIND, mehr über Sie zu erlernen. Helfen Sie bitte den Leuten, die für das Zur Verfügung stellen dieses elektronischen Buches verantwortlich sind. Sie wissen, daß wem sie sind und SieSIND in der Lage, ihnen zu helfen.

Helfen Sie ihnen bitte, in der Lage zu SEIN, schnell zu arbeiten, und stellen Sie elektronischere Bücher zur Verfügung Helfen Sie ihnen bitte, alle Betriebsmittel, das Geld, die Stärke und die Zeit zu haben, die sie zwecks sein müssen für, Sie zu arbeiten zu halten.

Helfen Sie bitte denen, die ein Teil der Mannschaft sind, das ihnen auf einer täglichen Grundlage helfen. Geben Sie ihnen die Stärke bitte, um jedem von ihnen das geistige Verständnis für die Arbeit fortzusetzen und zu geben, daß Sie sie tun wünschen. Helfen Sie bitte jedem von ihnen, Furcht nicht zu haben und daran zu erinnern, daß Sie der Gott sind, der Gebet beantwortet und der verantwortlich für alles ist.

Ich bete, daß Sie sie anregen würden und daß Sie sie schützen und die Arbeit u. das Ministerium, daß sie innen engagiert werden. Ich bete, daß Sie sie vor den geistigen Kräften oder anderen Hindernissen schützen würden, die sie schädigen oder sie verlangsamten konnten.

Helfen Sie mir bitte, wenn ich dieses neue Testament benutze, um an die Leute auch zu denken, die diese Ausgabe zur Verfügung gestellt haben, damit ich für sie und also, sie beten kann kann fortfahren, mehr Leuten zu helfen.

Ich bete, daß Sie mir eine Liebe Ihres heiligen Wortes (das neue Testament) geben würden und daß Sie mir geistige Klugheit und Einsicht, um Sie besser zu kennen geben würden und den Zeitabschnitt zu verstehen, dem wir in leben. Helfen Sie mir bitte, zu können die Schwierigkeiten beschäftigen, daß ich mit jeden Tag konfrontiert werde.

Lord God, helfen mir Sie besser kennen und zu wünschen anderen Christen in meinem Bereich und um die Welt helfen wünschen. Ich bete, daß Sie die elektronische Buchmannschaft und -die geben würden, die ihnen Ihre Klugheit helfen. Ich bete, daß Sie den einzelnen Mitgliedern ihrer Familie (und meiner Familie) helfen würden nicht Angelegenheiten betrogen zu werden, aber, Sie zu verstehen und Sie in jeder Weise annehmen und folgen zu wünschen. Geben Sie uns Komfort auch und Anleitung in diesen Zeiten und ich bitten Sie, diese Sachen im Namen Jesus zu tun, amen,

## Prayer to God

Dear God,

Thank you that this Gospel or this New Testament has been released so that we are able to learn more about you.

Please help the people responsible for making this Electronic book available. You know who they are and you are able to help them.

Please help them to be able to work fast, and make **more** Electronic books available

Please help them to have all the resources, the money, the strength and the time that they need in order to be able to keep working for You.

Please help those that are part of the team that help them on an everyday basis. Please give them the strength to continue and give each of them the spiritual understanding for the work that you want them to do.

Please help each of them to not have fear and to remember that you are the God who answers prayer and who is in charge of everything.

I pray that you would encourage them, and that you protect them, and the work & ministry that they are engaged in.

I pray that you would protect them from the Spiritual Forces or other obstacles that could harm them or slow them down.

Please help me when I use this New Testament to also think of the people who have made this edition available, so that I can pray for them and so they can continue to help more people.

I pray that you would give me a love of your Holy Word (the New Testament), and that you would give me spiritual wisdom and discernment to know you better and to understand the period of time that we are living in.

Please help me to know how to deal with the difficulties that I am confronted with every day. Lord God, Help me to want to know you Better and to want to help other Christians in my area and around the world.

I pray that you would give the Electronic book team and those who help them your wisdom.

I pray that you would help the individual members of their family (and my family) to not be spiritually deceived, but to understand you and to want to accept and follow you in every way.

Also give us comfort and guidance in these times and I ask you to do these things in the name of Jesus, Amen,

